von Carnap 17/10 1897.

Wm Kite

His Book –

Given Him by The Author

Decr 24th 1809

(Vulgarly called, from the opinion declared in these Pamphlets, "Doctor No-Devil.") WHB

Who Departed this Life

April 2th 1810

These two tracts were the Author's own copies; and the <u>MS. insertion</u> between pp. 39–40 of the second, the <u>extract</u> from Monthly Review at the end, and the <u>note</u> at p. 49, are in his own handwriting; as I was informed by the abovementioned Wm Kite, when I bought this and other vol^s of him, at Dover, 26 August 1842.

W. H. Black.

Vault 7440A791

(1) William Ashdowne's* Inquiry into the scripture meaning of the word Satan, &c. (London, 1772, pp. 40 & 77.)

*See the next pamphlet.

(2) William Ashdowne's Attempt to prove that the opinion concerning the Devil or Satan &c. hath no foundation in Scripture. Being a Supplement to [the foregoing] pamphlet. Second ed. (Canterbury 1794, pp. 63.)

With the Author's MS. additions.

(1)

AN

INQUIRY

INTO THE

Scripture Meaning of the Word

SATAN,

AND ITS

SYNONIMOUS TERMS,

The DEVIL, or the ADVERSARY, and the WICKED-*ONE*.

WHEREIN ALSO,

The NOTIONS concerning DEVILS, or DEMONS, are brought down to the STANDARD of SCRIPTURE.

The Whole INTERSPERSED with

REMARKS on various TERMS, PASSAGES, and PHRASES in the OLD and NEW TESTAMENTS: and undertaken with a View to illuſtrate the SCRIPTURES, and to ſeparate the WORD of GOD from the DOCTRINES and TRADITIONS of MEN.

What is written in the law? How readeſt thou?
Luke x. 26.

LONDON:
Printed for J. WHEBLE, No. 24, Pater-noſter Row.
MDCCLXXII.

D

W
2/IV/10

Ashdowne, William

Vault

A.243119
ME

ADVERTISEMENT.

CHRISTIANS, for many centuries past, have had ſuch variable notions concerning Satan and his Power, and the preſent prevailing notions are ſo unſettled, that there is no ſuch thing as fixing them from the writings of Divines: the Author therefore intends, in the courſe of this inquiry, to ſearch the ſcriptures, and to fix them on that foundation, which is, indeed, by much the ſureſt.

But the inquiry is ſet on foot with more views than one: for if it ſhould detect a prevailing error, more or leſs ſupported by all ſyſtems of Divinity, it will point out the danger of an implicit Faith, and may induce many to read the Scriptures more attentively, and to give them

that preference, in matters of doctrine, which is justly due to them. Moreover,

It is intended to prove, that many of the difficulties, which we meet with in the scriptures themselves, and which are so often complained of, arise from preconceived opinions, from wrong ideas annexed to scripture terms, and from mistranslations.

Lastly, It has been said, that "the "Scriptures are a field for contention;" but this opinion the Author hopes to confute, by shewing that the sacred writers speak uniformly and consistently to the same point, and elucidate each other, so as to leave no just grounds for dispute and cavil.

These and other good purposes may be answered by a candid inquiry; and a candid inquiry is all that is intended ---for no alteration should be made in the prevailing faith, unless it should appear to be groundless, erroneous, and unsupported by scripture.

The

The following ſheets contain only Introductory Remarks and Diſſertations, with ſo much of the Inquiry as relates to the Old Teſtament: but the Remainder ſhall follow in due time, if the Public ſhould ſeem diſpoſed to receive it with candour. However, it is fit that the Old Teſtament ſhould FIRST be thoroughly canvaſſed: and it is hoped, that freſh light may be thrown upon the ſubject, from that quarter, by ſuch as are converſant in the Oriental Languages.

The TITLE prefixed is adapted to the whole work, which will be included in as narrow a compaſs as is conſiſtent with a full inquiry: and the Author has no doubt but that the Reader will agree with him in this, viz. that the Scriptures ſhould be handled cautiouſly, and that *ſeemingly new interpretations* of them ſhould be conſidered leiſurely.

Introductory Remarks

AND

DISSERTATIONS.

IT is well known to the learned, that language is fluctuating and variable —so much, that the same word has denoted different things, in different periods of time: this may be exemplified in the word *villain*, which was once the appellation of any man, however honest, who held his lands by a servile or laborious tenure; but, at this time, is applicable only to a man of vile principles or practices[a].

The word Satan may, possibly, have varied its signification: and tho' it is now said to signify a Prince, or Chief, of

[a] So also the word *Knave* was formerly used to denote a servant: and an old translation of the New Testament has "Paul a Knave of Christ."

of fallen Angels, it is not clear that this was its original acceptation: neither is it clear that any Angels ever did fall—if by Angel we are to underſtand a ſpiritual intelligent Being, as the word is uſually defined.

Such a Notion, and that too *with all the authority of doctrine*, hath long prevailed in the Chriſtian Church, and is grounded, chiefly, on two Texts in the New Teſtament: but how favourable ſoever our tranſlation, and others, may be to ſuch a notion, it is not well ſupported by the original: for, in the Greek, it is uncertain whether any thing be ſaid of Angels, in the above ſenſe of the word. The texts are capable of a very different conſtruction, no leſs pertinent to the argument which they are brought to ſupport, and appear to be references to a notable paſſage in the Old Teſtament.

The two Texts which I am ſpeaking of, are, 2 Peter ii. 4: — and Jude 6: we ſhall introduce and examine them, in

their

their proper contexts, that the reader may be able to form a more correct judgment of them.

St Peter, towards the end of the first Chapter, of this his second Epistle, commends the persons to whom he wrote, for taking heed to a more sure word of prophecy: "For (says he) prophecy came "not in old time by the will of Man; "but holy men of God spake as they "were moved by the Holy Ghost." He then adds what, I conceive, should be translated as follows, or to the same purport.

"But there were also false Prophets "among the people, as among you "there will be false Teachers, *who will* "*introduce destructive heresies*[b], and deny- "ing *the Lord*[c] that bought them, do "bring upon themselves swift destruc- "tion. And many shall follow *their* *de-*

[b] Οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας,

[c] Τὸν — δεσπότην. See Job v. 8. Κύριον δὲ τὸν πάντων δεσπότην ἐπικαλέσομαι. LXX.

" *destructive heresies*[d], through whom the " way of truth shall be blasphemed, " and in covetousness with feigned words " they will make merchandise of you : " *to whom the judgment of old lingereth not,* " *and the destruction of them (of old) slumbereth not*[e]. *For if God spared not the* " *Messengers that sinned, but having tartarized them with chains of darkness, delivered them, thus reserved, unto judgment*[f]; " and

[d] Καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀπωλείαις. either " to their destructive heresies", the latter substantive being left out, or " to their destructions" that is, to like destructions.

[e] Οἷς τὸ κρῖμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει. Verse 3, — ἔκπαλαι Ch. iii. 5. G. Test. — " Τὸ κρῖμα ἔκπαλαι." " The judgment of old" is the same sort of expression as, " Τὸ δικαίωμα ἔμπροσθεν" " The ordinance formerly." Ruth iv. 7. See also Zacharias iv. 4. Malachias iii. 4. LXX. The Apostle here speaks of a judgment long since past, and of a destruction which overtook certain men of old, whose case was nearly similar to that of false Teachers. He proceeds to mention them in the very next verse.

[f] Εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας, παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τετηρημένους. Ver. 4.

In

" and ſpared not the old world, but
" preſerved Noe the eighth a preacher
" of righteouſneſs, having brought a
" flood upon the world of the ungodly;
" and did reduce the Cities of Sodom
" and Gomorrha into aſhes, condemn-
" ed

In our tranſlation, " If God ſpared not the Angels, &c." —but the Greek Language knows no diſtinction between an Angel and a Meſſenger. I have therefore done no violence to the Original: and, it is apprehended, there are good and ſufficient reaſons, why we ſhould rather prefer the word Meſſengers. It does not appear to me, that there was, in the apoſtles time, even ſo much as a tradition concerning Angels that had ſinned; but ſuppoſe there had, we can refer to ſomething, *better than tradition*, as a proof that God did not ſpare certain Meſſengers that ſinned — that they were tartarized with chains of darkneſs, and thus reſerved unto judgment, — to which they were at length delivered. That the Apoſtle here refers to a judgment paſt, is, I think, exceeding plain: It is apprehended his language, fairly taken, will admit of no other conſtruction: for the participle paſſive, *τετηρημένους*, which is in the perfect tenſe, can never be made to reſpect the future: and the other participles and verbs, in the aoriſt tenſe, have as certainly and evidently, a paſt ſignification in this verſe, as others, in the ſame tenſe, have in the following verſes. Add, to this, that the whole context of the paſſage requires this conſtruction.

" ed to that Cataſtrophe, being made
" an enſample to thoſe who ſhould after
" live ungodly; and delivered juſt Lot
" offended with the filthy converſation of
" the wicked — the Lord knoweth how
" to deliver the godly out of temptati-
" on, and to reſerve the unjuſt unto the
" day of judgment to be punished."

This tranſlation may be compared with our Engliſh verſion of the New Teſtament, and both of them with the original. The moſt material alteration is in verſe the 4th, — where, inſtead of *the Angels*, I have put *the Meſſengers*, that ſinned. Theſe Meſſengers, I apprehend, are no other than the men who were ſent, from the wilderneſs of Paran, to ſearch the Land of Canaan, which the Lord had promiſed to the Children of Iſrael. They were Meſſengers *that ſinned*, for when they returned, they laid before the people an evil and exaggerated report, which cauſed the heart of the people to faint, and diſcouraged them from following the Lord

who had promised. It moreover appears that they *were tartarized with chains of darkness*; for notwithstanding all that the Lord had done, before their eyes in the land of Egypt, and at the Red Sea — notwithstanding he had given them Bread from Heaven, and Waters out of the stony Rock — notwithstanding they had heard his Voice, and seen his Glory at the Mount; yet, *after all this*, they had not eyes to see, nor hearts to understand; but still erred and fell away in the day of temptation[g]: the Light

g The history of these Messengers, referred to by the Apostle, is to be found in the xiii. and xiv. Chapters of the Book of Numbers. See also Chap. xxxii. 8, 9, and Deut. i. 28. — from whence it appears, that the great apostacy from the Lord, in the wilderness, is imputed to these Messengers, who brought up an evil report upon the Land, and persuaded the people, that unsurmountable difficulties stood between them and the possession of it. There was, indeed, an evil heart of unbelief among the people; but, considering the station of the Messengers, they were most guilty: hence a more speedy and severe judgment overtook them. Caleb and Joshua, were not of the number of them that sinned: these two Messengers wholly followed the Lord,

Light had ſhined unto them, but they loved darkneſs rather: and from their whole conduct, we may infer, that as they juſtly might, ſo they really were, judici-

Lord, and ſtood forth, with Moſes and Aaron, to ſtem the defection of the people, aſſuring them that they would be well able, *ſince the Lord was with them*, to ſurmount all obſtacles — only, added they, ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου μὴ ἀποστάται γίνεσθε — " be not ye apoſtates from the Lord" — but the Evil Report of *their Brethren* prevailed. Of theſe it may well be ſaid that they were, σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας, — " tartarized with chains of darkneſs." If their caſe be attentively conſidered, this expreſſion will not be thought too ſtrong. It is ſaid of the Egyptians that they were δέσμιοι σκότους καὶ μακρᾶς πεδῆται νυκτὸς " bound of darkneſs and fettered of long night." — Vide, LXX. Wiſdom of Sol. xvii. 2. — but theſe Meſſengers appear to have been under a worſe than Egyptian darkneſs: and it was with them, as it was afterwards, with other Rulers of this ſtubborn People, they were, in the end, judicially blinded. I underſtand the word, ταρταρώσας, " tartarized," to be expreſſive of the gloomy horrors of their own minds: they ſhrunk at every difficulty, were always deſponding, and never ſaw any thing, before their eyes, but deſtruction and death; whereas faith, as a grain of Muſtard Seed, would have filled them with the moſt lively hope, and have been an anchor to their Souls. Modern unbelievers might learn from

judicially blinded in the end: or, as the Apoſtle expreſſes it, guarded or reſerved under chains of darkneſs unto judgment — to which they were at length delivered: for thoſe Men "Even thoſe Men, "that did bring up the evil report upon the Land, died by the plague before the Lord[h]."

We

from theſe, their brethren of old, to retreat in time, leſt their bands be made ſtrong — leſt chains of darkneſs be judicially laid on. Like modes of expreſſion occur — Pſalm cvii. 10. Καθημένους ἐν σκότει ϗ σκιᾷ θανάτου, πεπεδημένους ἐν πτωχείᾳ ϗ σιδήρῳ. "Sitting in darkneſs and in the Shadow "of Death, enchained in Poverty and Iron." And Proverbs v. 22. σειραῖς δὲ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν ἕκαστος σφίγγεται. "Each bound with Chains of his own Sins."

h See Numb. xiv. 37. It is apprehended this is the very judgment referred to, by the Apoſtle, and that he has not alluded to a future judgment: for not only the language militates againſt this ſuppoſition; but the context and argument do the ſame. How could a reference to a judgment yet future, prove that falſe teachers would bring a *ſwift deſtruction* upon themſelves? If we ſuppoſe the Apoſtle, as our Tranſlators have done, to have ſpoken of Angels that ſinned, ſuch a reference could have no weight, in his argument, any further than their judgment is allowed to have

taken

We have now ſeen how, and in what ſenſe, the language of the Apoſtle, is applicable to the Meſſengers. Let us juſt ſee, how ſuch a reference, will ſuit with the connexion and the Apoſtle's argument.

The paſſage begins with this obſervation — " But there were falſe prophets " among the people, as among you " there will be falſe teachers," and it is afterwards added " to whom the judg- " ment of old lingereth not, and the de- " ſtruction of them" (that is, I ſuppoſe, *of the falſe prophets of old*) " ſlumbereth " not."

Now

taken place. *Temporal judgments only* can be brought forth as Examples: and to ſpeak of a future one here, would be, at leaſt, ſuperfluous to the argument. But ſuppoſing a diſpute between God and his Angels, How came Men by the fact? It could not be viſible; and it is not revealed. And, why ſhould we recur to judgments both unrevealed and inviſible? Is it not better to rely on known facts? we conclude then that the judgment here ſpoken of, is a paſt temporal judgment, well atteſted — and is referred to by way of enſample, along with the judgment of the Old World, of Sodom and Gomorrha, on all of whom ſwift deſtruction once came.

Now we know that the Meſſengers, who went to ſearch the land of Canaan, were all of them Heads and Rulers in their reſpective tribes[i]: and it is not improbable, that they were of the ſeventy, who were appointed to bear the burthen of the people, together with Moſes — who were once partakers of the ſame Spirit and propheſied[k]; but not to inſiſt upon this, there is ſo much of the prophetic character upon them, and the word Prophet is uſed with ſo much latitude in the ſacred writings, that we need not ſcruple to allow them the Title. They were ſent forth by the commandment

[i] Numb. xiii. 3. Πάντες ἄνδρες ἀρχηγοὶ υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι.

[k] Numb. xi. 25. I apprehend it cannot be proved either that the Meſſengers were of the number of the ſeventy, or that they were not: However Joſhua, who was one of the Meſſengers, and afterwards led the people into the promiſed land, was already one of the firſt Men in Iſrael, and a choſen Man with Moſes. This may ſeem to favour the ſuppoſition that he was of the ſeventy; but we leave this matter as not thinking it any ways neceſſary to be inſiſted on.

ment of the Lord, and the end of their being ſent was, that they might bring back a faithful meſſage. They were the Meſſengers of the Lord, (as all his Prophets ſince) and were to declare to others, that which the Lord had intruſted to them: and tho' the matter they were charged with, was not a matter of Revelation to them, yet they were *prophets unto the people.* Moreover, as they brought up an evil report upon the land, and added the comment of an unbelieving heart, ſaying, " We are not " able to go up, &c." — and as they did hereby ſeduce, and turn away the people, from following the Lord, they were *falſe prophets:* they ſtand at the head of them, and were figures or types of thoſe who ſhould come after.

And there is a ſtrong appearance that the Apoſtle has conſidered them as types, and propheſied from them, of thoſe who ſhould come after. " There were (ſays " he) falſe prophets among the peo-" ple, as there will be falſe teachers among

"among you." As it once was so it will be again: the former figure out the latter[l].

Certain it is, that the Messengers, did "introduce a most destructive heresy" among the people of old: for only Caleb and Joshua wholly followed the Lord, and taught the people to trust in him: they only considered him as true to his Promise, and as present with his people to subdue their Enemies, that they might inherit that Promise: the other Messengers had made ship-wreck of their Faith — held a contrary opinion, and said *we are not able to go up, the people are stronger than we:* now if thus to apostatize from the Lord, to hold an opinion repugnant to his word[m], to enforce

[l] It is not clear that these words — ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν — (which may be rendered "An ensample *of those* "who shall after live ungodly,") do not refer back to the Messengers and old world, as well as to Sodom and Gomorrha. It will, at least, be allowed that the former, were as much *patterns* or *ensamples*, as the latter: and it seems as if they had been all more or less copied.

[m] It rendered *the promise of God* of no effect: they must go up, in order to inherit the promise.

force that opinion, and thereby to subvert many — If this, I say, be not Heresy, what is?

These Messengers also, "denyed the "Lord that bought them" — that redeemed them from the land of Egypt: and hereby "they brought upon them-"selves swift destruction". Again, "ma-"ny followed their destructive heresy" — to their destruction.——And "thro' "them the way of truth[n] was blas-"phemed:" for Moses was aware, that it would be said, "Because the Lord *was* "*not able* to bring this people into the "Land *which he sware unto them*, therefore "he hath slain them in the Wilderness."

We see then, that the character of the Messengers, as delivered down by Moses, perfectly agrees with the character of the false Teachers, as described by the Apostle: and so strong is the resemblance, that there is great reason to think

[n] The God of Truth — his word, worship and service. See Numb. xiv. 13. to 17.

think, he had his eye upon the former when he deſcribed the latter. There is not indeed one new feature, unleſs it can be found in the following words — " In covetouſneſs, with feigned words, " they will make merchandiſe of you." The Meſſengers dealt in feigned words; but how far they hoped to make a gain of the people I will not ſay[o].

From what has been ſaid, it plainly appears, that the Meſſengers that ſinned[p], is a *reference* well adapted to the Apoſtles purpoſe, and argument: and we ſhall not eaſily find another that would have ſuited ſo well: the time when theſe Meſſengers ſinned — the effect of their Apoſtacy — the numbers ſeduced by them — and the ſwift de-

 ſtruc-

[o] In this, perhaps, the falſe teachers might bear a greater reſemblance to the mercenary diſpoſition of the old world, or of Sodom and Gomorrha, who are alſo referred to; but if it was a peculiarity, it was fit to be taken notice of: and it is now *no new thing*.

[p] St Peter here calls the Meſſengers that ſinned *οἱ ἄγγελοι ἁμαρτησάντες*: The Author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, calls the People ſimply *οἱ ἁμαρτησάντες*. Heb. iii. 17.

ſtruction which overtook them, from the Lord, made their enſample ſuch, as might be urged, with peculiar fitneſs, at the beginning of the Chriſtian Diſpenſation: it has its uſe at all times: and the wiſe and prudent will ever look back to it with godly fear.

The Sin, Judgment, and Deſtruction, of theſe Meſſengers, are atteſted and delivered down by Moſes, faithful in the Houſe of God, and an Eye-witneſs of the Facts. The whole of the matter, therefore, would be received, by Chriſtians, as ſacred and ſealed truth — was moſt certainly believed among them, and received under this perſuaſion, that it was written for their inſtruction: perfectly adapted to the Apoſtle's purpoſe and argument, and ſo powerfully recommended — where is the other inſtance that would have an equal effect? The Story of Angels that ſinned, had it been as much believed in the apoſtle's time as it now is, is ſcarcely applicable, and could not have produced an equal effect.

effect. There is, therefore, reason to conclude, that the Apostle spake of the Messengers that sinned: and that all the instances, of the righteous judgment of God, referred to by him, are taken from the Scripture.

WE turn now to the Epistle of Jude, verse 6th which, along with its context, may be translated as follows.

"Beloved I have given all diligence "to write unto you of the common "Salvation, it being needful to write to "you, beseeching you to contend ear-"nestly for the faith once delivered to "the Saints. For certain men have "crept in unawares who were *of old pre-"figured unto this condemnation*[q], ungodly "(men) turning the grace of our God "into lasciviousness; and denying the

 only

[q] Jude, ver. 4.—Οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρῖμα "They of old *prefigured* unto this condemnation," the word *prefigured* is most suitable to the context, or sense of the passage at large, for the apostle has referred to the Types.

Sovereign ("Despot" p. 20)

" only Lord (δεσπότην) God and our Lord
" (κύριον) Jesus Christ. I will therefore
" put you in mind, though ye once
" knew this, that the Lord having saved
" *the people* out of the Land of Egypt,
" afterwards *destroyed them that believed*
" *not. And the Messengers who watched*
" *not duly over their principality, but deserted*
" *their proper station, he kept with perpetual*
" *chains under darkness unto the judgment of*

nay: see next page.

Types. The word προγεγραμμένοι (in Latin, prius descripti or coram depicti) is literally pre-described or pre-depicted; but to pre-describe any man, or set of men, in the persons of others (as in the persons of the People and Messengers in the wilderness) or to pre-depict, is exactly the same with pre-figuration. It will be said perhaps that the word sometimes signifies *prescribed,* in such a sense as implies *ordinance*: suppose it does, yet still it is *a written ordinance,* and this will refer us back to the Scriptures of the Old Testament: we say then that these " Certain men " crept in unawares" were *no otherwise ordained* unto the condemnation spoken of, than as they were *prefigured* in the persons of the Messengers, or of the People in the wilderness, under a former dispensation: and St Paul considers that dispensation as typical as well as St Peter and St Jude. See the Gr. Test. 1 Cor. x. 1st to 13th verse, and particularly the 6th and 11th verses.

" *the great day*[r]. As alſo Sodom and
" Gomorrha, and the cities about them,
" who after their manner, committed
" fornication and followed after ſtrange
" fleſh, are ſet forth for an enſample,
" ſuſtaining the judgment of eternal
" Fire."

[r] Jude 6th. Ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν, ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον, εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας, δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν. Literally tranſlated thus " And the Meſſengers — thoſe " who *guarded not* their Principality, but deſerted their " proper ſtation, *he guarded* with perpetual chains under " darkneſs, unto the judgment of the great day." The above tranſlation is in ſenſe the ſame with this: for to guard a thing is to watch duly over it, or to look well after it, but this the Meſſengers (who were Rulers in their reſpective tribes) did not do by their charge — by which I would be underſtood to mean, " the people committed to their care," over whom they had τὴν ἀρχὴν — principality; but if they exerciſed their authority, it was in a way directly contrary to the end for which it was given, for they perverted the people from following the Lord: therefore the Lord guarded them, or kept them duly, with perpetual chains of darkneſs, until that aweful day in which he thought fit to pronounce and execute his righteous judgment upon them. See Numb. xiv. 22, 23 — and 35, 36, 37.

This tranſlation is, at leaſt, as conformable to the original as that in our Engliſh Verſion: and I think it is leſs exceptionable in its ſenſe.

By certain men crept in unawares, ungodly men, turning the grace of God into laſciviouſneſs, and denying the only Deſpot, God and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, we are chiefly to underſtand falſe teachers, who were active in the buſineſs; but the Apoſtle has an eye to the deceived, as well as the deceivers: for it was his care for the people that made him give all diligence to write: and not only the deceivers, but the deceived alſo, were prefigured of old, unto righteous judgment or condemnation.

Therefore, Jude, who wrote with an earneſt Zeal to preſerve the People from ſeduction, ſets out very judiciouſly, with holding up to their view the people in the wilderneſs who were ſeduced by the Meſſengers. He ſays, " I will therefore " put YOU — (that is, YOU PEOPLE) " in mind, tho' ye once knew this,

" that

" that the Lord having ſaved THE PEO-
" PLE of old, out of the Land of Egypt,
" afterwards *deſtroyed* them that believed
" not." Nor did they — much leſs did they eſcape, who taught or confirmed them in their unbelief: for "The Meſ-
" ſengers, thoſe, at leaſt, who watched
" not duly over their Principality, but
" deſerted their proper ſtation, he kept
" with perpetual chains under darkneſs
" unto the Judgment of the great day."

This will not need much explanation, to ſuch as have made themſelves maſters of the hiſtory of the Meſſengers, and have attended to the remarks we have made in the foregoing pages: theſe Meſſengers had each of them a Principality — were all of them Heads and Rulers in their reſpective Tribes: in this exalted ſtation, the Lord — the God of Abraham their Father, had placed them, that, in the Faith of HIM, they might go up at the head of HIS PEOPLE, and conduct them unto the poſſeſſion of the promiſed land: but *they*

+ The idea is not that of watching, but of retaining, holding fast.

watched not duly over their principality — over thoſe who were under their authority: they were not active, nor anxious, to keep them in the right way, — ſteadfaſt unto the Lord: neither did they encourage, and conduct them forward, to the promiſed Poſſeſſion: nay, *they actually deſerted their proper ſtation*; for they abſolutely refuſed to go up at the head of their reſpective people, as was their office and duty to have done.

St Jude ſays they were "kept with "perpetual chains under darkneſs[s]; un- "to the judgment of the great day." — So indeed it appears: otherwiſe they would have been enlightened, and have per-

[s] Δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν — "he kept (or "guarded) with perpetual chains under darkneſs" — here is no mention of any place of darkneſs; but only *under darkneſs*: ſo, I apprehend, Peters expreſſion σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας, which I have tranſlated, "tartarized with "chains of darkneſs," is expreſſive only of that gloom or darkneſs in which their minds were held. As the apoſtles may be ſuppoſed, to have expreſſed the ſame thing in different words, the reader will do well to recollect, what has been obſeved, on the words of St Peter.

perceived that God was well able to bring his people into the land which he had promiſed, and to ſubdue all their Enemies under them. But let the juſtice of God ſtand clear — they were not concluded under darkneſs, till they had firſt reſiſted, or cloſed their eyes upon, a light, which would probably have ſaved Sodom and Gomorrha: they were ſtill the children of unbelief, after all his works and wonders which he had ſhewn them — after all the marvellous things that he did before them, in the land of Egypt, in the field of Zoan — after he divided the Red Sea, thro' which they paſſed as on dry land — after he had "daſhed in pieces" their old Enemy and Oppreſſor, Pharaoh, with all his chariots and his hoſt, over whom he, the Lord, triumphed gloriouſly, and threw the horſe and his rider into the ſea. After all this theſe Meſſengers were in darkneſs[t] — this ten times, ſaith the Lord,

[t] It was revealed unto Abraham, that "his ſeed ſhould "be ſtrangers in a land that ſhould afflict them 400 years "— and

Lord, have they tempted — have they provoked me. In ſhort their darkneſs was perpetual and accompanied them unto

" — and afterwards that nation will I judge ſaith the " Lord." Gen. xv. 13, 14. So the Egyptians " afflicted " Iſrael — made them ſerve with rigour — made their lives " bitter with hard bondage — ſlew their male children — " and mightily oppreſſed them." Therefore did the Lord judge that nation. "The Children of Iſrael ſighed and " their cry came up unto God — he heard their groaning " and remembered his covenant with Abraham :" here is the primary cauſe of the judgments upon Pharaoh and the land of Egypt. And if the Lord *hardned the Hearts of Pharaoh and his People*, who had *before* approved themſelves oppreſſors and murtherers, ripe for deſtruction — " That " he might multiply his ſigns and his wonders, and make " his name glorious throughout the earth" — where is the injuſtice ? The cauſe of the judgments exiſted before God ſpake unto Moſes, and Pharaoh's heart being hardned, only determined *the mode*, in which they ſhould be introduced : and nothing could be more beneficial to the world than Pharaoh's hardneſs. Obſerve alſo, with reſpect to the Meſſengers, that the arm of the Lord had been amply revealed, before the day in which they firſt ſet foot in the wilderneſs — or at leaſt on that day : and both they and the people had already ſufficient grounds for believing the Lord and truſting in his Power : certain it is, that when they had corrupted themſelves with the molten calf, he threatned

unto the judgment of the great day, when the Lord pronounced judgment against them, and they *died of the plague* before him[u].

Now if the case of the Messengers was such as has been represented, (and it is submitted to the reader whether it was not,) then, what could tend more to preserve the people of God from false teachers, than an apprehension that they were typified or prefigured under these Mes-

ned to consume them; what shall we say then? was not his anger *justly* kindled? had they not already deserved to die the death? doubtless. But suppose he forbare and suffered their manners, yet a long time in the wilderness, and kept them in chains of darkness till a future day, that he might more effectually instruct the world in his fear — suppose this, and the dispensation is gracious. By wisely timing the judgment of these Messengers, we are taught the danger of departing from the Lord, of distrusting his Power, and of seducing his People.

[u] Εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας — τετήρηκεν "kept them — "unto the judgment of the great day;" In Peter's Epistle — παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τετηρημένυς — "delivered them *kept* or "*reserved* unto judgment." The language, context and argument, require *both* to be interpreted of a judgment past:

Meſſengers? — every part of whoſe character, as drawn out by the Apoſtles, is calculated to create a godly jealouſy and fear: and the ſwift deſtruction which overtook them, in the day that the Lord roſe up to judgment, together with the overthrow of all the People in the wilderneſs, who were joined to them, could not fail of having a powerful effect upon ſuch as feared God.

WE have now examined the Texts ſeparately: and may obſerve that Peter and Jude have, upon the whole, ſaid the ſame things — nearly in the ſame language; but there is ſome difference between

paſt: and tho' the phraſes, ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη, ἡ ἡμέρα κυρίȣ, ἡ ἡμέρα μεγάλη, &c. have moſtly been underſtood of *one day*, in which God will judge the quick and dead; yet this does not always hold in the New Teſt. and ſeldom, if ever in the Old. The judgment pronounced and executed, *from thenceforth* upon the people, and *ſpeedily* upon the Meſſengers, in the wilderneſs, ſignalized that day or time: hence it is called, ἡ ἡμέρα μεγάλη "the great day." It was alſo a day or time of Judgment: and other times of temporal judgment are *ſtill more emphatically* marked. See Joel ii. 31. Malachi iv. 5. Matthew x. 23. &c.

between them, which deſerves to be taken notice of.

St Peter *propheſied* — foretold the Brethren, that as there had been falſe prophets among the people of old, ſo there *ſhould be* falſe teachers among them — who would introduce deſtructive hereſies, and deny the Lord that bought them.

St Jude did *not propheſie*: he had facts before him: certain men *were crept in* unawares, ungodly men, who were actually turning the grace of God into laſciviouſneſs, and denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. So far Peter's prediction was already fulfilled.

Peter had ſaid, reſpecting theſe men — that many would follow their deſtructive hereſies — that thro' them the way of truth would be blaſphemed — and that in covetouſneſs, with feigned words, they would make merchandiſe of the People.

Jude ſeems to have apprehended all this, and therefore, to prevent the miſchief

chief, gave all diligence to write unto the people — referring to events recorded in the Old Teſt. full to the above purpoſe — if conſidered as Types.

Peter ſays, that theſe falſe teachers would bring upon themſelves ſwift deſtruction — that to them the judgment of old lingered not, and the deſtruction of them (of old) ſlumbered not: this he explains and exemplifies — by *the Meſſengers that ſinned* in the wilderneſs, as being indeed a moſt applicable inſtance — and ſupports it with two others, the *old world*, and *Sodom and Gomorrha*—on all of whom ſwift deſtruction once came.

Jude ſays they were prefigured, or pre-depicted of old, and barely refers the people to their types, or exemplars, THE MESSENGERS — and herein he leaves his readers to judge of the event[w].

But

[w] Verſe 5th, " I will therefore put you in remembrance " tho' ye once knew this" — tho' ye muſt have heard or read of it " how that the Lord, &c." His barely putting them in remembrance of the ſcriptures referred to, is, I think, a ſufficient proof that he would have them conſidered

as

But what is moſt worthy of note, is that the two Apoſtles had ſomewhat different views in writing — not ſo much upon the whole, as in thoſe particular parts of their Epiſtles, which have fallen under our notice.

Peter propheſied of falſe teachers, and deſcribed their character, *that they might be known,* when they ſhould appear.

Jude had perceived their entrance into the Church, and gave all diligence to write, that he might, if poſſible, *preſerve the people from ſeduction.* — Hence, he very prudently confounds the falſe teachers, with thoſe taught by them — conſiders them together as one body of ungodly men prefigured of old — and inſerts, what it nearly concerned the

D People

as typical: indeed if it were not ſo, if God's former diſpenſations were not predeſcriptive, and certain indications, of his future dealings with men, there could be no certain inſtruction derived from them. This will be allowed with reſpect to his judgments: and ſimilar judgments ſeem to imply a ſimilarity of Character, in the perſons judged.

People to know and keep in mind, viz "That the Lord having ſaved the people "out of the Land of Egypt, afterward "deſtroyed them that believed not." And the Meſſengers alſo — he reſerved unto judgment. This was bringing the matter home to the people, and was well calculated to convince them, that their firſt care ought to be for themſelves. And tho' this, reſpecting the people in the wilderneſs, is left out of Peter's prophecy, reſpecting falſe teachers; yet it neither is, nor ought to be omitted, in an addreſs to the people to guard againſt them[x].

UPON

x Peter refers to the Meſſengers *only*; becauſe ſuch reference *only* was full and direct to the purpoſe of his Prophecy reſpecting falſe teachers, who in Station and Character would reſemble the Meſſengers; but Jude firſt refers to the People ſeduced by them, as a thing moſt neceſſary to be kept in mind, by the then People of God, when falſe teachers were among them. It appears to me, that Peter has propheſied from the Meſſengers as Types, and that Jude refers to *Them* and *the People of old* as ſuch — as St Paul has done in his 1 Epiſtle to the Corinthians, Chap. x.

already

UPON the whole, nothing can be more evident, than that the perſons who ſinned, mentioned by St Peter, and thoſe who watched not duly over their principalities, mentioned by St Jude, are the ſame; and we conclude, from the foregoing obſervations, that they were juſt as much Angels — as thoſe received by Rahab, the harlot; who, we certainly know, were neither more nor leſs than Meſſengers[y]. This interpretation is not only more countenanced by the language of the Apoſtles — is not only more ſuitable to the connection and argument; but it reſts on a much better foundation, on a more clear and undoubted authority, than that which is commonly received.

already referred to in note q.——But ſuppoſing this was not ſo, that would not prove that there is any reference to Angels or ſpiritual Beings.

y James ii. 25. " Was not Rahab the Harlot juſtified " by works when ſhe had received τὺς ἀγγέλυς, the Meſ- " ſengers"—ſent by Joſhua to ſpy ſecretly, and to view the Land, even Jericho. Joſhua, Chap. ii.

St Jude ſays, he put the people in mind of what they once knew; but ſuppoſing him to ſpeak of "Angels "which kept not their firſt eſtate; but "left their own habitation, and are "reſerved in everlaſting chains under "darkneſs unto the judgment of a great "day, yet future," as in our tranſlation ——ſuppoſing Jude to ſpeak thus, and whence ſhould the people once have known it? The Old Teſtament ſays not a word of any ſuch thing: and the whole ſect of the Sadducees, in our Saviour's time, believed neither Angel nor Spirit to exiſt; but confined their Faith to one God only: — apprehending, I ſuppoſe, that the Angels and Spirits, mentioned in the Old Teſtament, were meer imaginary Beings, introduced for the ſake of repreſentation.

The Phariſees, it is true, confeſſed both Angels and Spirits: and the ſcriptures, doubtleſs, countenance ſuch a belief; but as we are cautioned not to intrude into

into things not ſeen, and told that ſecret things belong to the Lord, we ſhall do well not to be wiſe above the reach of reaſon and ſenſe, and what is written or revealed. What can fairly be collected from the ſcriptures, on this head, is, in ſum, nearly as follows.

Angels are repreſented unto us as a ſuperior order of Beings, employed as *the Meſſengers* of God: and hence they derived their name. The Old and New Teſtaments both favour the Idea of a local Heaven, where God is more peculiarly preſent, where the Angels behold his face, and receive his commands: from hence they are ſaid to be diſpatched, on ſome particular occaſions, to reveal or to execute the will of God: and once in the Old Teſtament we read, that God ſent evil Angels among the Egyptians — as alſo of the deſtroying angel; but this is ſpoken only in reſpect of their commiſſion, which was to hurt and deſtroy; for both were per-

fectly ſubject and obedient unto God[z]: ſo that, on the whole, there is not the leaſt ground to believe, that any Angel, or Angels, were ſuppoſed to have fallen, from their original dignity and allegiance to God.

The Jews who confeſſed Spirits, conſidered them, chiefly, as having their place upon earth, tho' they did acknowledge others elſewhere: in the New Teſt. in particular, we have often read of Dæmons, of impure or evil Spirits:— theſe they apprehended to be the ſouls of dead or departed men, as we ſhall, here-

[z] Evil Angels, ſo called, becauſe *ſent* to inflict Plagues upon Egypt, or the Egyptians. Pſ. lxxviii. 49. A deſtroying Angel becauſe *ſent* to deſtroy the people, or to ſmite with the peſtilence. 2 Sam. xxiv. 16. But there are ſome able interpreters who think theſe Angels *denote* the plagues only: God is repreſented as acting by Angels or Meſſengers: and it is certain that "Fire and Hail, Storm and "Tempeſt, Plague and Peſtilence, may be *his Meſſengers* "to fulfil his word." An appearance, in caſe of Plague, may denote only the divine preſence: and prove, that it was from, or of the Lord, not natural.

hereafter endeavour to prove[a]: but it doth not at all appear, that before, at, or ſhortly after our Saviour's time, any ſpirits were judged to be fallen Angels, or ſpiritual Exiſtences that had ſinned: both ſacred and profane hiſtory give a very different account of them.

The Gods, Demi-gods, Dæmons, &c. of the Gentile world, were, indeed, very numerous; but there is nothing in the Theology, or Pneumatology, of the Heathen Writers, not even of their Poets, from whence we may conclude, that they conceived of any of them as fallen Angels: for the famous Pluto, was own brother to Jupiter, and his Miniſters, tho' ſaid to execute ſevere puniſhments, were faithful in their reſpective truſts, and executed judgment and juſtice only:

 — unleſs

[a] The Notions concerning Dæmons, about our Saviour's time, have been collected, from the beſt authorities, by Dr Lardner, in his Tracts; by Dr Newton, in his Diſſertations on Prophecy; and lately by Mr Farmer, in his Diſſertations on Miracles: It only remains, that we ſhould ſearch the Scriptures, and point out ſome Errors in the application of known Truths.

— unlefs the Judges erred through ignorance; tho' that was never fufpected by the ancients.

Therefore whether St Jude wrote to Jews or Gentiles, there is little ground to think, that he reminded the people only of what they once knew, if he meant to be underftood as fpeaking of Angels, or Spiritual Beings, " who kept " not their firft Eftate, but left their " own Habitation, &c[b]". — However, fuppofe we fhould, without reafon, (or againft all the reafons that have been advanced)

[b] The authority of this Epiftle of Jude, as well as of the 2. Epiftle of Peter, was much queftioned, in the early ages of the Church, chiefly on account of fome references, thought to be apocryphal: I might therefore argue, that fo far as *the doctrine of fallen Angels*, is grounded on any thing, contained in thefe two epiftles, fo far *that doctrine* is of doubtful authority: and indeed if the reference to angels that finned, were a reference to an apocryphal Book, the argument would be good. But I have not availed myfelf of fuch an argument. The prophecy of Peter, it feems, approved itfelf by facts: and, whenever that happened, the Epiftle of Jude was worthy of acceptation.

advanced) grant that ſuch a notion did once prevail; yet if it was merely conjecture, and reſted only on human authority, is it likely, that Peter and Jude, ſhould both put their apoſtolic ſeals to it? Or ſuppoſe we ſhould deſcend a little further, and even allow the thing to have been moſt certainly believed, and that too upon good authority, tho' this doth not at all appear; yet ſtill, Angels that ſinned, would be an inſtance leſs adapted, to the Apoſtles argument, than that of the Meſſengers that ſinned: for, beſides what has already been urged on that head, we may yet add — that if Angels and Men, have different natures and different powers (as is generally believed) then the juſt judgment of God upon the former, might not at all affect the latter: nor doth it appear that there is any ſimilarity, between the circumſtances of the falſe teachers, who ſhould afterwards come, and the circumſtances of the Angels who are ſaid to have ſinned: and if we take the paſſages, as

they

they ſtand, in the received tranſlation, we ſhall find a difference and diſproportion, between the parts which ought to agree, on which account the argument becomes looſe and inconcluſive. We therefore conclude, that the Meſſengers, who by a falſe and evil report, cauſed the people of old to apoſtatize from the Lord, and who did thereby bring ſwift deſtruction upon themſelves — this, I ſay, is a reference much more applicable and proper in the caſe of falſe teachers — againſt which the Apoſtles are cautioning the people, and ſhewing them that they ſhould bear their judgment, whoever they were, as others before them had done.

But there is great reaſon to believe, that the notion of fallen Angels, *firſt aroſe*, from a miſconſtruction of the very paſſages we have been conſidering. The Gentiles, when they came to preach the Goſpel, not being ſufficiently read and ſkilled in the Jewiſh Scriptures, that is, in the Old Teſtament, might eaſily o-

verlook

verlook the reference, and lay hold of the Texts in queſtion to account for the Evil Spirits, mentioned in both the Old and New Teſtaments — and for the Devil and his Angels, mentioned in the Goſpel of Matthew.

And when once theſe Texts came to be miſconſtrued of fallen angels, and that interpretation came to be received, it is no more to be wondered at, that it hath continued a received doctrine, than that the doctrines of purgatory, tranſubſtantiation, and others, ſhould ſtill continue, and be received, in the Church of Rome. When error is once ſubſtituted and eſtabliſhed for truth, it is afterwards taken for granted, without examination: ſo the ſyſtem of fallen Angels, once wrought up, and gloſſed over, hath for ages been ſwallowed without ceremony.

But it will certainly be granted, that Peter and Jude, may have referred to the Meſſengers that ſinned: and it ought to be granted that the Greek is not wreſted,

nor the ſenſe of the paſſages injured, when made favourable to ſuch a reference: hence it will follow, that all that has been ſaid, and written, for centuries paſt, concerning fallen Angels, may have no grounds in Scripture: for the two paſſages we have been conſidering, have ever been urged, as the moſt direct proofs, that Angels did ſin and fall.

There is reaſon, therefore, to ſtand in doubt whether Satan be a fallen Angel: and upon the ſuppoſition that he may not, it is propoſed to ſearch the Scriptures: a cloſe attention to what is written therein concerning him, will, moſt probably, lead us to the true Idea, which we ought to annex to that formidable name.

AN INQUIRY

Into the Scripture Meaning of the Word

SATAN, &c.

THE purport of this inquiry is, chiefly, to inveſtigate the ſenſe of the word Satan, as it is uſed in ſacred writ: And that we may not, at laſt, fix on an erroneous ſenſe, it is propoſed to examine every paſſage wherein the word occurs. It will be much if the ſpirit of God (even in this matter) has not conveyed a clear and determinate ſenſe to poſterity: Some paſſage or other will doubtleſs ſpeak plain; and, I hope, there are none which are cloathed with impenetrable darkneſs.

Truſting, therefore, that God has not left us in the dark, in matters which we are concerned to know and underſtand,

ſtand, we turn to his word with the greater alacrity—in humble confidence that this our labour will not be in vain.

It will be proper that we ſhould begin with the Old Teſtament—herein, in our Engliſh verſion at leaſt, the word occurs only four times,—or on four different occaſions. Namely, In the firſt Book of Chronicles, Chap. xxi.—In the Book of Job, Chap. i. and ii.—In the cixth Pſalm.—And in the Prophecy of Zechariah, Chap. iii. We now proceed to examine the paſſages, in order as they occur, more particularly with a view to determine the ſenſe of the word Satan.

In 1 Chron. xxi. 1. it is written that "*Satan* ſtood up againſt Iſrael, and pro-"voked David to number Iſrael."

We have a parallel to this ſcripture. 2 Samuel. Chap. xxiv. 1.—where we read that "The anger of THE LORD "was kindled againſt Iſrael, and HE "moved David againſt them, to ſay, go "number Iſrael and Judah."

In

In order to a right underſtanding of the Hiſtory, contained in the two Chapters juſt referred to, and to prove that the writers of them are no ways inconſiſtent with each other, it may be proper to make ſome remarks, not abſolutely neceſſary to the inquiry we ſet out upon.

It has been aſked, how David ſinned in numbering the people? — and, why the deſtroying Angel was ſent forth on that occaſion?

In anſwer to theſe queſtions, we may refer to Exodus, Chap. xxx. 11th to 17th Verſe — where we are informed, that — "The Lord ſpake unto Moſes, "ſaying, when thou takeſt the ſum of "the Children of Iſrael, after their num-"ber; then ſhall they give every man "a ranſom for his ſoul unto the Lord, "that there be no plague among them "when thou numbereſt them —— and "thou ſhalt take the atonement money "(which was half a ſhekel per man) of "the Children of Iſrael, and ſhall ap-

" point it for the ſervice of the taberna-
" cle of the congregation, that it may
" be for a memorial unto the Children
" of Iſrael before the Lord, to make an
" atonement for your ſouls." This, it ſeems, was to be a ſtanding ordinance in Iſrael, when the ſum of the people, from twenty years old and upwards, ſhould be taken: but after ſuch an ordinance was given, nothing but a command from God, or a ſtrong and manifeſt neceſſity, could juſtify ſuch a ſtep as that of numbering the people: for as every man, from the richeſt down to the pooreſt, was to give half a ſhekel on this occaſion, David ought not to have amuſed himſelf, at ſuch an expence to each individual in his kingdom, who exceeded the age of twenty years: and to number the people without the ranſom was a direct tranſgreſſion of the ordinance.

This without all doubt was the real truth of the matter: David appears to have had no intention of taking the

ranſom

ranſom money of the people, when he ſent Joab to number them; but only to know their number. In this, therefore, *he ſinned* againſt an ordinance of the Lord, and the ranſom *not being given* by *the people*, was the *apparent* treſpaſs for which they fell.

The King's order to number the people was diſagreeable (the text ſays abominable) to Joab: and he expoſtulated with his Uncle, ſaying, "Why doth "my Lord require this thing? Why "will he be a cauſe of treſpaſs to Iſ-"rael?" He, and the Captains of the hoſt, conſidered the matter as drawing the whole nation into a treſpaſs: Notwithſtanding they could not prevail with David to deſiſt. Such was his curioſity to know the number of the people!

As the hiſtory in Samuel is firſt, in the order of our Bible, and traces the matter to the fountain, we ſhall clear it, in the firſt place, and then proceed to ſhew, how the account in the Chro-

nicles is perfectly consistent and reconcileable therewith.

In Samuel it is said — "Again the "anger of *the Lord* was kindled against "Israel, and *he* moved David against "them, to say, go number Israel and "Judah."

The same form of expression occurs frequently in the Old Testament. It is said that "God moved the Captains of "the King of Syria, to depart from Je-"hoshaphat King of Judah[a]:" And David said unto Saul "If the Lord have "stirred thee up (or, have moved thee[b]) "against me, let him accept an offer-"ing; but if the children of men, "cursed be they before the Lord." The Lord, also, is said, — to move to jealousy, — to stir up adversaries, — to stir up a scourge, — to stir up the Medes, &c.

There is, no doubt, a propriety in this mode of expression: it denotes that the

[a] 2 Chron. xviii. 31.

[b] 1 Sam. xxvi. 19.

the providence of God, is ſome way concerned, in bringing about thoſe things, unto which he is ſaid to move; or that ſuch and ſuch movements are by his appointment. To the ſame effect, Adonijah ſays "The Kingdom is turned a-"bout, and is become my brother's, for "it was his from the Lord[c]."—And "Eli "expoſtulated with his ſons for their "wickedneſs; but *they hearkened not* for "*the Lord would ſlay them*[d]." So David conceived it poſſible enough, that Saul's perſecution of him, might be from the Lord, for ſome ſin that he had committed: and ſo, alſo, in the Text under conſideration, it is ſaid, that "The Lord's anger was kindled againſt Iſrael, and therefore he moved David againſt them to number them—to draw on them a treſpaſs, with reſpect to an ordinance which himſelf had given them.

What! did God draw on them a

 treſpaſs?

c 1 Kings ii. 15.

d 1 Sam. ii. 25.

trespass? Was he any ways concerned in making them transgress his own ordinance? We have said so; and doubt not but his providence was concerned. But observe — that this ordinance (and many others which God gave unto Israel, his people, by Moses) had nothing morally good or evil in it. The reason, why God chose *this people* to be *his people*, was, that he might, *through them*, manifest himself *unto all the world*[e]: and *one reason*, why he gave them so many external ordinances, was, that he might manifest himself the sooner and more clearly: for these external ordinances enabled the surrounding nations to judge, with the greater certainty, of the obedience or disobedience of Israel, unto the *Lord* their *God*: and when they also saw a blessing or curse follow (and these too were visible that they might see) what could tend more to extort this confession, "THE LORD, HE IS THE "GOD:"

[e] See Exodus vii. 5. and Numb. xiv. 21.

"GOD:" for the Gods of the nations never appeared to do good or to do evil — to execute the leaſt judgment or juſtice upon earth — to ſave or to deſtroy.

Therefore, tho' many of the ordinances, which the Lord gave unto Iſrael, had naturally no goodneſs in them: yet it was good for the world that ſuch ordinances were given: it was good not only for thoſe who were near, but even for thoſe who were afar off — the former would ſee, and the latter would hear, how the Lord walked with Iſrael: and the concluſion was near unto both — that there was no God like unto the Lord — none, whoſe works, were like unto his works.

When the Moſaic Diſpenſation, with its ceremonial Law, attended with the temporal bleſſing and curſe, is conſidered in this light, it will appear, every way worthy of God, — founded in wiſdom, and goodneſs, and grace.

And tho' Iſrael was a ſtiff-necked peo-

ple, that neither did nor could prevent the Lord from manifesting himself, through them: for if they forsook him and his ordinances, so that he could not bless them in the eye of the surrounding nations, then the curse took place: and the Lord set visible marks of his displeasure upon them, and upon the land which he had given them. In the day of transgression, when they refused to hearken and obey, he made the plagues of the people grievous: and their Land, which was as the garden of Eden, became like the country of Sodom and Gomorrha, Admah, and Zeboim, which the Lord overthrew in his anger and in his wrath: so that the next Generation, and their children, and the stranger that came from far,—even all Nations should see the Lord's doings, and say, "Wherefore hath the Lord done "thus unto this land? what meaneth "the heat of this *great anger?*" The answer was near and ready—"Because "they have forsaken the covenant of "the

"the Lord, the God of their Fathers[f]." Hence, if he could not teach the Nations, by bleſſing his people, that he was good and gracious, a rewarder of them who diligently ſought him; he taught them, at leaſt, by the curſe, that he was a God executing judgment and juſtice, and truth in reſpect of his word and promiſe — that vengeance belonged unto him and he would repay.

There is no doubt, however, but a neglect of moral precepts, and a diſobedient heart, were always moſt diſpleaſing in the eye of God: and the Lord might often ſee ſufficient cauſe, to correct his people for hypocriſy, for cloſe and ſecret ſins, whilſt, in the eye of men, they kept his ordinances. He might juſtly have ſmitten, when the ſurrounding Nations could not well know, wherefore the Lord had done the thing. But he forbare till their tranſgreſſion became manifeſt: and his providence might ſometimes be concerned in making it ſo, that his judgments might be

[f] See Deut. xxix. 18. to 29.

be manifested also, and teach the world righteousness.

Thus the sons of Eli were far gone in wickedness before their father expostulated with them: that God whose priests they were could not be pleased with their doings; nay, he had determined to make his wrath known, and therefore defeated the effect of their Father's counsel, that, by making them ensamples, he might teach future Priests to shun their crimes: and when their wickedness was fully ripe, in the eyes of all the people, he cut them both down, in one day.

Thus, also, in the case before us, Israel had displeased the Lord, and his anger was kindled against them, before he moved David, to say, "Go number "them."— They were already vessels of wrath fitted to destruction, however close and secret their wickedness might be: and therefore did he move David to draw on them a trespass, in respect of an external ordinance — by which visible

viſible treſpaſs, and the viſible judgment that followed it, the ſurrounding nations, thoſe of them at leaſt, who had eyes to ſee and ears to hear, might ſurely profit.

But be it remembered, that, the Lord did not move David to draw his people into a treſpaſs againſt any moral law: and recollect alſo, that the judgment inflicted was temporal only. As to the judgment of the great day, when God ſhall judge the quick and the dead, we only know, that the judge of all the earth will certainly do right.

However it was that David was moved to number the people, he did not perceive it as a notice from God: for his heart ſmote him when he had done the thing: and indeed as he had an expreſs command not to number them, without the ranſom; nothing but an expreſs command to the contrary, would have been a ſufficient diſpenſation: beſides, the inſtruments, whereby God effects his purpoſes, are not always innocent.

cent. He may move the blood-thirſty to ſlay the guilty rather than the innocent: but bloodſhed is not therefore excuſable in the agent: he that thirſteth after blood is a murtherer in principle, and the Lord only directs that principle to his own wiſe ends, making it ſubſervient to his providence: ſo ſome paſſion might work in David, which was not good in the ſight of God, and this he might convert towards numbering the people, rather than ſuffer it to take a turn no leſs wicked, and eventually productive of more evil. Numbering the people was an event, which God made uſe of to his own glory, and the good of mankind: ſo our Hiſtorian, who was a Prophet, perceived this, and that the thing was from the Lord, tho' David himſelf did not: his convictions, therefore, were juſt enough, that he had done fooliſhly. Thus much on this remarkable piece of hiſtory as it ſtands in the ſecond Book of Samuel. But,

The compiler of the firſt Book of Chronicles

Chonicles informs us that, " SATAN " ſtood up againſt Iſrael, and provoked " David to number Iſrael." THE LORD, therefore, moved David, to number the people, BY SATAN — who was the inſtrument or means in the hand of the Lord.

Thus much we certainly know, that the word Satan ſignifies an adverſary of ſome ſort or other. And,

When Solomon's ſtrange wives had drawn him into Idolatry, it is ſaid, that, " The Lord ſtirred up an adverſary unto " him, Hadad the Edomite[g]:" and again, that, " He ſtirred up another adverſary, " Rezon the Son of Eliadah[g]. In the Septuagint this occurs in one and the ſame verſe — which runs thus " And " the Lord raiſed up Satan to Solomon, " Hadad the Edomite, and Rezon the " Son of Eliadah — and they were Satan to Iſrael all the days of Solomon[h]."

Here

gg 1 Kings xi. 14—23.

h Vide LXX. 1 Kings xi. 14.

Here the word Satan evidently means, an Adverſary, or Adverſaries, at war with Solomon and his people Iſrael. And there can be no reaſonable ground of doubt, but that the Satan, who provoked David to number the people, was an Adverſary of the ſame ſort — an Adverſary whom the Lord had raiſed up, threatning him, and his people, with war. Such an Adverſary, eſpeci ally if a powerful one, would naturally ſuggeſt to David the thought of numbering his people—that he might know his ſtrength, and what force, he could, on occaſion, bring to the field.

The ſenſe of the word Satan, in the above quotation from the Septuagint, is clear and evident to every capacity: that ſenſe therefore is authorized by the Septuagint[i]: and as this ancient verſion of the Scriptures is moſtly (if not always) quoted

[i] This ſenſe is authorized from other paſſages in the Hebrew; but as the Author is not ſkilled in that language, he chooſes to reſt on the authority of the Septuagint alone.

quoted in the New Teſtament, we need not wiſh a better authority: it has the ſeal of our Lord and his Apoſtles in matters pertaining to doctrine: but if it had not --- if we ſhould ſet it on a level only with other ancient authors; yet even then its authority muſt be ſufficient when the ſenſe of a word only is to be determined from it: for the Seventy would doubtleſs make uſe of words in the ſame ſenſe in which they themſelves, and others of their times, underſtood them.

We have therefore already attained to a clear and determinate ſenſe of the word Satan, under the hand of the Seventy interpreters: and we may be certain, that in their times, it denoted an Adverſary or an Enemy at war with Iſrael: this ſenſe doth eaſily and naturally diſſolve a ſeeming inconſiſtency between two parallel Scriptures, which hath been, in theſe latter times, not a little excruciating to interpreters and commentators: ſince, therefore, by applying a ſenſe

ſenſe clearly aſcertained in one paſſage, the inconſiſtency between two others hath vaniſhed at once, this ſtamps a value upon our diſcovery, and ſhould teach us, not wantonly to depart from that ſenſe of ſcripture terms, which the ſcriptures themſelves have clearly diſcovered: for it is eaſy to ſee, in the caſe before us, that we may be greatly miſled by Traditions and Syſtems.

We conclude therefore, that as the Lord raiſed up Satan, or an Adverſary, unto Solomon, Hadad the Edomite, and Rezon the Son of Eliadah, and that as they were Satan, or Adverſaries, unto Iſrael, all the days of Solomon; ſo when the anger of the Lord was kindled againſt Iſrael he raiſed up Satan, an Adverſary, *i. e.* ſome neighbouring King or Kings, and by this means did he move David againſt them to ſay go number Iſrael: for, when ſuch an Adverſary ſtood up, he provoked David to number his men of war: and in doing this

he and his people trefpaffed againft the Lord.

When a word has once acquired a meaning, diftinct and different from that which was in the writer's mind, and which he intended to convey; it is no wonder if the paffages, wherein fuch word occurs, fhould be perplexed and difficult: Ideas to which the writer was a perfect ftranger, prefent themfelves unto the reader: hence, the connection becomes broken or difmembered, and the fenfe of the paffage incoherent, if not contradictory. Thus the reader, with his own Ideas, ftrives in vain to underftand his author, and thinks the fault is in the book, which is only in his own underftanding: This, I am afraid, is often the cafe with fuch as complain of great difficulties in fcripture: for tho' there fhould be fome things hard to be underftood, from the very nature of the fubject, yet this will never be complained of by thofe, who underftand the more eafy (but not lefs

weighty) matters, contained in the sacred volume.

But if, through the ignorance or craft of men in ages paſt, any conſiderable number of ſcripture terms, loſt their primitive meanings and acquired new ones, this would ſpread a vail of darkneſs over the whole: and it will never be removed till the primitive meanings are aſcertained and reſtored: through the bleſſing of God upon the labours of his ſervants, who have ſought the truth in the love of it, and in his own word, much hath been done in late times: but there is ſtill work for the ſkilful ſcribe: and tho' he has the labours of many good and learned men before him, it is not his buſineſs to dwell too much upon them; but rather to ſearch the ſcriptures, and to contribute his mite to theirs, by adding ſuch obſervations, as a cloſe attention to the original, may enable him to make: and the leſs he is held in bondage by preconceived opinions, the more likely he will be to diſcover

cover the truth: for we ſhall profit more, if we come to read the ſcriptures without any Ideas annexed to the terms, than with wrong ones.

To exemplify this in the caſe before us—If any man had thought himſelf wholly ignorant of the ſenſe of the word Satan, and had obſerved it firſt in the book of Chronicles, if the ſenſe had not diſcovered itſelf at ſight, he would have examined the connection—he would have conſidered what was moſt likely to provoke David to number Iſrael: and it is much if he had not ſuſpected that ſome Enemy threatened his dominions: he would have read a little further, and have obſerved, that when Joab, the captain of his hoſt, returned the number, he returned ſuch men only as drew the ſword[k]: this would have gone a great

[k] I apprehend, all Iſrael from twenty years old and upwards were *men of war, that drew the ſword*, as occaſion might require: The ordinance had reſpect to theſe only; and

way towards removing all his doubts, and would have confirmed him in his conjecture: In the laſt place, he would have obſerved the meſſage which the Lord ſent unto David by the Prophet, "Chooſe thee — either three years famine, or three days peſtilence, or "three months to be deſtroyed before "thy Foes, while the ſword of thine "Enemies overtaketh thee." This ſtill tended to confirm his firſt apprehenſions: for it appears from hence that David had foes at this very time, enemies ready to overtake, and fall upon him: 'tis true God could have raiſed up an Enemy, in a very ſhort time, if there

and was given partly, at leaſt, to the end they might not be numbered: Iſrael were not to regard their number, becauſe their battles were the Lord's: and it was nothing with him to ſave with many or with few: their ſtrength was to walk humbly with their God—to keep his covenant, his ſtatutes, and ordinances; which done, one of them ſhould chaſe a thouſand: ſo that they had little more to do than to "ſit ſtill and ſee the ſalvation of the Lord." But, to thoſe without, the ordinance had another uſe.

there had not been one already in the field; but his usual working has been, to raise up nation against nation, by means which operate slowly, and give leisure to prepare for the battle.

Thus a man, not first misled by his own Ideas, would, most probably, discover the true meaning of the word Satan, in this passage, from the connexion, or thread of the history, without any other assistance; but if he opened his Septuagint, and found the authority we have quoted, it would be impossible for him, afterwards, to entertain a doubt.

But how wide is the difference when men are under the influence of wrong Ideas! To this, doubtless, it must have been owing, that commentators have overlooked the true sense, and adopted one absolutely irreconcileable, with the parallel passage in the second book of Samuel.

I have called the sense above given the true sense, as I do not see, how the shadow of an objection can be raised.

It is true there is no particular mention made of the Adverſary or Enemy of David: we are not told from whence he aroſe, nor what became of him afterwards: but this proves nothing againſt what has been advanced. The Hiſtory of David's enemies, wars, battles, &c. would have filled a volume much larger than the Bible: ſuch an Hiſtory as this the ſacred writers had no intention to give: their province was to preſerve the memory of God's dealings with his people: and in noting down that ſignal judgment when the people were numbered, it was ſufficient juſt to obſerve, that Satan, an Adverſary or an Enemy, provoked David to do the thing.

If we compare this paſſage in the Chronicles, with that in the book of Samuel, we ſhall obſerve, — that the difference in the relations hath ariſen merely, from the different lights, under which the two writers have viewed the matter, and ſet it forth: Samuel has traced it to the bottom. He ſays,

"Again

" Again the anger of the Lord was kin-
" dled againſt Iſrael"—and *therefore* he moved David to ſay " Go number them." They had before been troubled with domeſtic and foreign wars; but their wickedneſs was not yet corrected: they had ſinned again, for the anger of the Lord was kindled afreſh: He had determined to make his wrath known, and therefore moved David, by providential meaſures, to number this people: and when they had treſpaſſed againſt one of his external ordinances, making their tranſgreſſion viſible in the eye of the ſurrounding nations, the Lord, then, made bare his arm, and ſmote them with the peſtilence. The wiſdom of this proceeding is evident: had the Lord puniſhed them before, for their cloſe and ſecret ſins, the nations around them would not then have known, wherefore the Lord had done this thing:—they might have been tempted to think that the Lord was not ſo good and gracious, nor ſo tender over his people, as they had

 heard:

heard: nay if Iſrael had departed from the Lord in heart only, and outwardly obſerved his ordinances (in which caſe he might juſtly have ſmitten them; yet if he had done ſo) the people in whoſe ſight they dwelt, might have judged hardly of his judgments, as if he ſlew the righteous as well as the wicked: but when, by his providence, their tranſgreſſion was made open and viſible in the ſight of all men, his righteous judgment would then appear, the arm of the Lord would be revealed, and the nations of the world would receive inſtruction.

The author of the account in Chronicles has not traced the matter ſo deep; but has related it juſt as it appeared in the eyes of men: He ſays, Satan, i.e. an Adverſary or an Enemy, ſtood up againſt Iſrael, and provoked David (naturally enough) to number the people: and, he ſays, the Lord was angry with *this thing* — for that he was angry *before*, none but a prophet, or a man of

enlightened

enlightened underſtanding could know: For *this thing*, alſo the people are ſaid to have been ſmitten with the peſtilence: and ſo the world would judge; but in ſtrict truth the cauſe of the judgment laid further back: for the Lord was angry before.

From the account in Samuel, compared with that in the Chronicles, we learn — that the anger of the Lord was kindled againſt Iſrael for prior ſins, and therefore he [1] raiſed up Satan, i. e. an Adverſary or Enemy, who provoked David to number Iſrael and Judah — even all his valiant men that drew the ſword: and when they had thus manifeſted their tranſgreſſion, by treſpaſſing an ordinance, which treſpaſs was expreſsly threatened with a plague, the Lord then ſmote

[1] 2 Sam. xxiv. 1.—This "*He*" has been tortured to confeſs what it never meant. It has been ſaid that "It was *not the Lord* but *He*, that is, *Satan*, who moved David." This is ſtraining to reconcile paſſages it is true; but it will ever remain evident that the word *He* doth here relate to *the Lord*, and to nothing elſe.

ſmote them with the peſtilence; and there died of the plague ſeventy thouſand men.

The ſenſe of the word Satan, 1 Chron. xxi. 1. the hiſtory contained in the chapter, and the divine proceedings with reſpect to his people, are, I hope, ſufficiently cleared: and tho' I have introduced matters ſomewhat foreign to my inquiry, yet it is hoped, every attempt to elucidate the ſcriptures, will be candidly received: add to this, that a little variety, provided it has the leaſt diſtant relation to the ſubject, may well be diſpenſed with, till the ſubject ſhall open and enlarge itſelf.

Any further remarks upon the above paſſage would be impertinent: for as it is inconteſtibly clear from the Septuagint, i. e. in 1 Kings xi. 14. that the word Satan doth there ſignify an Adverſary or an Enemy at war with Iſrael; ſo when the ſame ſenſe is applied here, 1 Chron. xxi. 1. it is no leſs clear that it is the true one: theſe two paſſages agree, in

ſupporting

ſupporting one and the ſame meaning of the word, and authorize us to ſay, that we have acquired *ſome* knowledge of our ſubject.

The authority of the Septuagint is as good an authority as can be wiſhed for, and indeed it is much to be doubted whether we have a better: however, thoſe who underſtand the Oriental languages need not reſt here—if it may be of any ſervice, in the preſent caſe, to ſeek elſewhere: but as the word Satan is not Greek, it was doubtleſs retained from the original, which the ſeventy had before them.

The Greek word διάβολος has, in ſcripture, the ſame ſenſe or ſignification as the word Satan. This is evident from Eſther vii. 4, and viii. 1. for Haman, who is called ὁ διάβολος, was an Adverſary or an Enemy unto Iſrael: the above paſſages are rightly tranſlated in our bible —"*The Enemy* (or Adverſary) could "not countervail the King's damage;" and "Ahaſuerus gave the houſe of Haman

" man *the Jews Enemy* unto Esther the Queen [m]." So if we follow the Septuagint version of 1 Chron. xxi. 1, we shall rightly translate " An Enemy stood " up against Israel, and provoked David " to number Israel [n]." This is good intelligible English, and such as a common soldier would readily understand.

THE word Satan next occurs in the 1st and 2nd chapters of Job: where, if a different sense, from that already attained, should seem necessary, it will then be fit to examine the context with the greater care and attention.

The learned are not agreed, whether this book ought to be understood as a real History, or as an instructive composition of art. I take it the first opinion is better grounded, and rather to be

m See the Septuagint. Esther vii. 4. Ου γὰρ ἄξιος ὁ διάβολος τῆς αὐλῆς τȣ βασιλέως. and viii. 1. ὅσα ὑπῆρχεν Ἀμὰν τῷ διαβόλῳ.

n 1 Chron. xxi. 1. Καὶ ἔστη διάβολος ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἐπέσεισε τὸν Δαυὶδ τȣ ἀριθμῆσαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

be followed; but it may be neceſſary to make this conceſſion, that in ſome parts the author has had recourſe to figurative repreſentation.

The book begins with the character of Job, who is the principal ſubject of the Hiſtory. This character is given in a few plain comprehenſive words, comprized within the compaſs of five verſes; but what follows, verſe 6th to the 13th — is not quite ſo eaſy to comprehend. It is probable, however, that the difficulty ariſes from our own Ideas — from ſome miſtaken notions — or from want of ſkill in the Eaſtern manner of repreſentation: what is written for inſtruction, as this book doubtleſs was, ſhould not be clothed with too much myſtery, for that would defeat the end propoſed: we muſt conclude, therefore, that the writer was perfectly intelligible to the people of his own times; and that there is a key, if we can but find it, which will eaſily unlock

the myſteries of this book, and open our way to the inſtruction contained therein.

Having given us the character of Job, our authors words are theſe " Now
" there was a day when the *Sons of God*,
" came to preſent themſelves before the
" *Lord*, and Satan came alſo among
" them: and the Lord ſaid unto Satan
" whence comeſt thou? Then Satan an-
" ſwered the Lord and ſaid, From going
" to and fro in the earth, and from
" walking up and down in it. And the
" Lord ſaid unto Satan, Haſt thou *conſi-*
" *dered my ſervant* Job, that there is none
" like him in the earth, a perfect and
" an upright man, one that feareth
" God and eſcheweth evil? Then Satan
" anſwered the Lord and ſaid, Doth Job
" fear God for nought? Haſt not thou
" made an hedge about him, and a-
" bout his houſe, and about all that he
" hath on every ſide? Thou haſt bleſ-
" ſed the work of his hands, and his
" ſubſtance is encreaſed in the land. But
" put forth thine hand now and touch

" all

" all that he hath, and he will curse " thee to thy face: And the Lord said " unto Satan, Behold all that he hath is " in thy power, only upon himself put " not forth thine hand. So Satan went " forth from the presence of the Lord." Now,

Supposing there had been no mistake concerning Satan, but that he were a Being inflexibly wicked, and lost to every spark of goodness—that his enmity against God neither did nor could abate, and that his malice, unprovoked, were uniformly set to spread corruption and destruction through the works of God—suppose this, and it appears highly incongruous, that such a Being should come into the more immediate presence of God, as Satan is here said to do: and, again, it seems no less incongruous, that God, who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, and in whose sight the heavens are not pure, should condescend to speak familiarly with a Being whose impurity and iniquity are supposed to be

be inconceivably great, and alſo immutable; yet the Lord is repreſented as ſpeaking familiarly with Satan—even as a man doth with his friend: he ſhews no marks of diſpleaſure againſt him; but delivers thoſe bleſſings and comforts of life into his hand, which had before been the portion of his own moſt righteous ſervant—and this only to convince him that his ſervant was ſincere, and ſerved with a voluntary and free ſervice.

We may obſerve further that theſe words "Haſt thou conſidered my ſervant "Job," are ſpoken by way of admonition. Satan, or the Adverſary, is aſked, if he had *conſidered*—if he had *duly revolved in his mind*[o], the character and virtues of Job, that eminent and faithful ſervant of the Lord. But this could anſwer no end, if the words are addreſſed to a Being loſt beyond the reach of mercy, and concluded in a ſtate from whence there is no redemption.

[o] Προσέχες τῇ διανοίᾳ σου.

Many other objections might be brought againſt the received ſenſe of the word Satan, in this paſſage; but theſe are ſufficient to excite ſuſpicion and attention. Let us therefore look narrowly to the Character, and try if we can fix it with greater certainty — or ſo, as may be leſs liable to exception.

We have already ſeen that the Adverſaries or Enemies of Iſrael, or of the Lord's people, are Satan: ſuch were Hadad the Edomite, and Rezon the Son of Eliadah of Zobah, in the days of Solomon: and as this is the only ſenſe of the word, which we have, as yet, been able to aſcertain, it will be proper to try how far it will go, in the preſent caſe.

When Job, the ſervant of the one true God, was in his proſperity—when the Moſt High had bleſſed him *with health* and *abundance of all things*—even in that day " Did the Sons of God come " to preſent themſelves before the Lord, " and Satan, or the Adverſary, came alſo " among them." Now if *the Sons of God*

 are

are *Men*, it is moſt natural to ſuppoſe that *the Adverſary* is to be underſtood of *Men* alſo — who were not Sons of God; but Adverſaries [p] unto them.

But in the Septuagint verſion of the Scriptures, we do not read the Sons, but the Angels, or Meſſengers of God: and in order to make the oppoſition more exact, Satan, the Adverſary, may be underſtood of Angels or Spirits, who in this caſe oppoſed themſelves. Suppoſe them ſuch who ſtood in the preſence of God [q]. But obſerve,

The author does not ſay that this was any

[p] Adverſaries of the people of God, were moſtly the ſervants of other Gods — of Gods that were no Gods. Idolaters.

[q] There is, however, no neceſſity to ſuppoſe them either fallen or evil Angels; but only Angels oppoſing Angels: and that not *really*, but *in ſuppoſition only*, for the ſake of repreſentation. I ſee no grounds in ſcripture to believe that any Angels ever did fall. And that doctrine, as now received, is liable to great exceptions. Suppoſing an Arcangel, and a whole order of angelic Beings, to have unhappily

any way revealed to him, either by word, or by viſion, or otherwiſe[r]. We have therefore no authority to underſtand it in any other light than as a machinery of his own raiſing, to anſwer the purpoſe of repreſentation. And it is ſo well conſtructed that it lets us at

happily ſinned againſt God their common Father; yet who ſhall ſay that He, "whoſe *tender mercies* are over *all his* "*works*," would have ſhewn no mercy to ſuch Sons?—or that "judgment without mercy" begun at the head of the creation, when not a ſparrow falls to the ground without our Heavenly Father? Beſides, it is not eaſy to be conceived, how ſo many of the perfecteſt of created Beings ſhould degenerate, at once, into mere abſtracts of malice and wickedneſs.

r We may obſerve that the book of Job is wrote *throughout* in the Hiſtorical Stile: and when the author ſays, that "There was a day when the Sons, Angels, or Meſſen-"gers of God, came to preſent themſelves before the "Lord, and Satan came alſo among them"— he gives not the leaſt intimation that he was a prophet; but this he ſhould have done, if he had hoped to be underſtood *literally* as ſpeaking of facts which no human eye could ſee, and which could not be known, but by immediate revelation. It is therefore moſt reaſonable to conclude that the repreſentation is figurative.

once, into the reaſon and uſe of Job's afflictions.

The Sons of God, or his Angels, or Meſſengers, repreſent the worſhippers of the one true God, and Satan is the repreſentative of their Adverſaries: The parties are brought into the preſence of God to inſtruct us that his providence directed, and why, and what, he did direct.

Satan or the Adverſary, is aſked whence he came — but ſurely this queſtion, which our author has put into the mouth of the Lord, was put altogether for our ſakes: known unto God are all his works, and there is no creature which is not manifeſt in his ſight; but to prevent miſtakes it might be neceſſary that we ſhould be informed that Satan, or the Adverſary, goeth to and fro in the earth, and walketh up and down in it. Here we ſhall be ſure to find the Adverſaries of the Lord's people; but Job's Adverſaries are here more particularly marked, who were rovers and wanderers

ers that lived by plunder and depredations[s].

This Satan, or the Adverſary, had an opportunity of obſerving and profiting by the example of Job, a moſt eminent ſervant of the true God: and therefore another queſtion is put with great propriety, "Haſt thou conſidered my ſer-"vant Job, that there is none like him "(my ſervant) in the earth, a perfect "and upright man, one that feareth God "and eſcheweth evil." God is glorified in his Saints that are upon earth: and he appeals to their adverſaries, themſelves being judges, whether the excellency of his ſervice is not manifeſt in the excellency of his ſervants. His ſervant Job was the beſt, and he had made him the greateſt alſo, of all the men in the Eaſt, that the Adverſary might ſee, and

 conſider,

[s] The Sabeans and Chaldeans; οἱ αἰχμαλωτεύοντες καὶ οἱ ἱππεῖς; yet the word Satan need not be underſtood of them only: but rather as having a diſtant reſpect to all the adverſaries of the people of God.

confider, and know, that the bleffing of the Lord is upon them that fear him. The Lord therefore afks that queftion which his providence afked daily, "haft "thou confidered my fervant Job?"

The Adverfary had confidered, or at leaft had obferved, both his piety and his greatnefs; yet converfion did not follow: the anfwer was ready—"Doth "Job fear God for nought? haft not "thou made an hedge about him, and "about his houfe, and about all that "he hath on every fide? thou has bleffed the work of his hands, and his "fubftance is encreafed in the land. But "put forth thine hand now and touch "all that he hath, and he will curfe "thee to thy face."

Satan is here made to deliver his own fentiments; and nothing can be more characteriftic: it has always been the Lot of the Lord's fervants to be evil fpoken of, to be charged with hypocrify and worldly views. The Adverfary, or Adverfaries,

versaries, have never done them justice in this respect.

The worshippers of strange Gods, did not deny the Lord to be a God — nor yet that he protected and blessed his servants [t]: the arm of the Lord was too often, and too clearly, revealed to leave them in doubt of the above matters; but still they looked unto their own Gods, and would not acknowledge that his servants were more excellent than their neighbours. Thus the Adversary said, Job is bribed to his service; doth he serve for nought — with a free and voluntary service? no: he, his house, and all that he hath, is hedged about on every side: but let the Lord his God bring him into troubles like other men — let the Lord put the cup of affliction into his hand, and see whether he will not change his God, or curse the Lord even to his face.

A better defence could not be put in-

[t] 1 Kings xx. 23. — 28.

to the mouth of the Adverſary: there is weight in every part of it: for if Job's ſervice was not free, wherein was it to be accounted of? Bleſſed, all around, an hypocrite might ſerve: and perhaps nothing, but a reverſe of fortune, could effectually convince the Adverſary, that their eſtimate was falſe.

The Lord ſays of his people who obey his voice, ye are *my peculiar treaſure;* but *all the earth is mine:* even the Adverſaries of his people are his — the work of his hands: and tho' they have erred from his ways, his providence is concerned to bring them back unto himſelf.

His ſervants are his prieſts through whom he makes himſelf known: His praiſe is in their fidelity, and he crowns it with glory and honour. So here Job is called forth to ſuffer for his ſake; that the Adverſary might ſee and know, that it is the Lord that maketh poor and maketh rich; that bringeth low and lifteth

up

up — and that his ſervants are the excellent upon earth.

Therefore, that Job might glorify the Lord in adverſity as well as in proſperity — the Lord ſaid unto Satan, or the Adverſary, "Behold all that he hath is "in thy power — only upon himſelf "put not forth thine hand." Hereby the author of this book has given us to underſtand, that Job was delivered unto affliction, of the Lord — for the conviction and inſtruction of the Adverſary.

Thus far all is clear: let us now ſee how far this ſenſe is confirmed or combated by the ſequel.

When all that Job had, even all his ſubſtance, was delivered into the hand of Satan or of the Adverſary, obſerve what became of them. Whilſt his oxen were plowing in the field, and the aſſes feeding beſide them — *the Sabeans* fell upon them and took them away, and ſlew the ſervants with the ſword: *The fire of God* fell from heaven, and burnt up the ſheep, and the ſervants, and conſumed

ſumed them: *The Chaldeans* made out three bands, and fell upon the camels and carried them away, and ſlew the ſervants with the ſword: and whilſt his ſons and his daughters were eating and drinking in their eldeſt brother's houſe — behold, there came *a great wind from the wilderneſs*, and ſmote the four corners of the houſe, and it fell upon them and they died.

Thus was Job ſtript of all that he had: and we ſee by whoſe power, or by whoſe hand. The Enemy is not hid. — His Adverſaries the Sabeans and Chaldeans have poſſeſſed themſelves, at leaſt, of his oxen, his aſſes, and his camels: and have ſlain his ſervants, who kept them, with the edge of the ſword: they have contributed moſt largely to pluck him bare: and therefore it is reaſonable to conclude, that Satan, or the Adverſary, is to be underſtood chiefly of them: and it was becauſe of them, or for their ſake, that *the fire of God* fell upon his ſheep and ſhepherds — and that *a great*

wind from the wilderneſs ſmote the houſe of his eldeſt ſon, and buried all his children in the ruins:—but if this is not ſatisfactory, recollect "that the very "ſtars from heaven, once *fought* againſt "Siſera:" and here the elements themſelves become Satan, or Adverſaries, unto Job. Lightning has deprived him of his ſheep and ſhepherds, and a great wind of his ſons and daughters.

We have now ſeen the power or powers that prevailed againſt Job: and if you would know in whoſe hand they originally are, take the information from his own mouth. Theſe are his words. "*The Lord gave*, and *the Lord* "*hath taken away*, bleſſed be the name of "the Lord."

So then, "In all this Job ſinned not, "neither did he charge the Lord his God "fooliſhly;" but the Adverſary was not yet put to ſilence: and therefore Job is again called forth, to ſuffer yet more for their ſake.

Hence, our author erects his ſcenery a

ſecond time. " Again (ſays he) there " was a day, when the Sons (Angels " or Meſſengers) of God, came to pre- " ſent themſelves before the Lord, and " Satan (or the Adverſary) came alſo " among them to preſent himſelf before " the Lord. And the Lord ſaid unto " Satan from whence comeſt thou? and " Satan anſwered the Lord, and ſaid, " from going to and fro in the earth, " and from walking up and down in it. " And the Lord ſaid unto Satan, Haſt " thou conſidered my ſervant Job, that " there is none like him in the earth, a " perfect and an upright man, one that " feareth God, and eſcheweth evil? And " *ſtill* he holdeth faſt his integrity, al- " though *thou* movedſt *me againſt him,* to " deſtroy (or rather *to afflict*) him *without* " *a cauſe.*"

Theſe laſt words, ought not, by any means, to be underſtood as if they were ſpoken to a real evil, or wicked ſpirit, incapable of repentance or amendment: for if ſuch a Being did ever exiſt, he could

could not poſſibly move the Lord to de-ſtroy, or even to afflict, his righteous ſervants, *without a cauſe:* ſhould this be admitted it will clearly overthrow the moſt certain knowledge we have of God, either from reaſon or revelation.

But if by Satan we are to underſtand the Adverſaries or Enemies of the Lord's people, or if they are included in the I-dea, then for their ſakes, that they may be converted and ſaved, the Lord may af-flict the moſt righteous of his ſervants, and that too, when there is *no cauſe in themſelves*: and it is a known truth, that the firſt chriſtians were afflicted, and many of them delivered up unto cruel deaths, not for their own ſakes, but for the unbelieving world—for the ſake of their Adverſaries, who were ready enough to believe them hypocrites in the day of proſperity: however when they were permitted to try their fidelity, and found them hold faſt their integri-ty in the midſt of affliction—when they ſaw and conſidered the firm unſha-

ken

ken faith and virtue of the servants of Christ — even the Adversary himself (in many of his members) glorified God by believing on him. And such, or a like reason, we are taught to assign, for the sufferings of Job.

As in the former case, so in this, the parties are brought into the presence of God, to inform us that providence directed in all that befel this eminent man: and the dialogue marks out beyond a possibility of mistake (provided only the terms are understood) the reason and end of his sufferings.

Satan, or the Adversary, is asked if he had considered Job, the servant of the Lord, — that still, in all his affliction, he held fast his integrity. This should have wrought conviction; but it seems there was still an evasion: for Satan answered the Lord and said — "Skin for "skin, (or skin after skin) yea all that "a man hath will he give for his life. "But put forth thine hand now, and "touch his bone and his flesh, and he

" will curſe thee to thy face." The ſentiment conveyed in theſe words is — that the proſpect of death brought near, would ſhake the integrity, or manifeſt the hypocriſy, of Job[t]: ſo did the Adverſary judge of the diſciples of Chriſt, and they too were permitted to try the experiment. So, now,

That the mouth of the Adverſary might be ſtopped — that they might ſee, and conſider, and be convinced. " The " Lord ſaid unto Satan, (the Adverſary) " Behold he is in thine hand, but ſave " his life[u]. So Satan went forth from " the preſence of the Lord, and ſmote " Job with ſore boils, from the ſole of " his foot unto his crown."

It is ſufficient to juſtify the expreſſion that Satan ſmote him, if he was ſmitten on Satan's account, or for his cauſe. Thus if an innocent man is brought to the block, we overlook the judge and executioner,

[u] Obſerve, that this grant, as well as a former, is given to convince Satan of his miſtake: Cui bono? if ſuch a Being as is uſually apprehended?

executioner, and charge the falſe witneſſes with the innocent blood. So the blood of Chriſt is ſometimes charged upon the rulers of the Jews, and ſometimes on the whole houſe of Iſrael, tho' both the ſentence of death, and the execution of it, proceeded from other people. They who were ſo active in procuring his death, crucified the Lord of life: and the judge and executioners, are moſtly, if not always, overlooked.

We might perhaps have found inſtances ſtill nearer the caſe of Job; but the above is near enough to ſhew, that the ſtroke is not always imputed to the hand that ſtrikes it. And tho' Satan is here ſaid to have ſmitten Job with ſore boils, yet if Job himſelf was not miſtaken he received this evil at the hand of God. So alſo did his wife and friends, and all who ſaw him, determine. It is the determination of reaſon and common ſenſe, which we may ſafely abide by: and this author has, *here only*, imputed it to Satan, or the Adverſary, to the end

that

that we might know, for whoſe ſake or on whoſe account he was ſmitten.

It may be fit, however, to keep in view the machinery of this author: He makes Job's Adverſaries appear in the preſence of God by a repreſentative, bearing their name and character: and whatſoever was done by them, or for their ſakes, this repreſentative is ſaid to do: for them the elements became Adverſaries to Job — fire fell from heaven and burnt up his ſheep and his ſhepherds, and a wind from the wilderneſs deprived him of his children — for them alſo he was ſmitten of ſore boils: now it was fit that all this ſhould once, at leaſt, be charged to the Adverſaries account; for without this we ſhould not have known that they were concerned in it: but how ſhall it be charged on their repreſentative? why, commit the elements into his hands, and let him have power to ſmite with boils — let him uſe this power, and the thing is done.

There is the greater propriety in this

repreſentation of the Adverſary; becauſe the lightning and wind, and ſecond cauſe of the boils, did really ſtand over againſt Job, and became Satan or Adverſaries unto him — joining iſſue with his other Adverſaries: and the repreſentative would not have been complete, without they were repreſented alſo: So that the Idea of Satan may, if neceſſary, be extended as far as there is an Adverſary to be taken in: we may add alſo, that it was no unuſual thing among the ancients, to give an animate repreſentative to things inanimate[v], and to ſecond cauſes[v] of which they were entirely ignorant: inſtances of this abound in ſcripture, and the beſt of the heathen poets have immortalized their names by the

[v] Numb. xvi. 30. "If the earth open her mouth and "ſwallow, &c."

Jeremiah xlvi. 10. "The ſword ſhall devour, ſhall be "ſatiated, and made drunk with their blood."

Iſaiah iv. 4. "The ſpirit of burning."

Luke xiii. 11. "A ſpirit of infirmity."

the exeellency of their repreſentations in this way.

The commandment was delivered unto the Lord's people of old in theſe words —“ Hear, O ISRAEL, the Lord our “ God is one Lord. And THOU ſhalt “ love the Lord THY God, with all “ THINE heart.” Nobody entertains a doubt but that this is addreſſed to the people at large. It certainly was.—But how is it addreſſed to them?—plainly in the perſon of Iſrael their Father, who is here, and elſewhere, THEIR REPRESENTATIVE: to HIM the commandment is delivered: and yet the people always underſtood that it was delivered unto THEM. They never once thought of ſetting aſide the commandment, becauſe it was delivered to their repreſentative only. They well knew that ſuch a diſtinction would have been fooliſh and vain: and it is no leſs ſo to diſtinguiſh between Satan and the Adverſaries of the Lord's people: for Satan is as much a

representative of the one, as Israel is of the other.

Again, the language, and acts of Israel, are, in this case, understood to be the language and acts of a people: and as Satan is equally a representative, his language and acts ought to be interpreted by the same rule: we have applied them to a people in the case before us, (i. e. in the case of Job) and the reader may judge with what propriety.

We may further observe that the words Israel and Satan, when applied in this sense, are both APPELLATIVES, and consequently ought not to be understood of an individual, but of many: thus David *numbered* Israel — and Hadad, Rezon, and their forces, were Satan to Israel — as the Sabeans and Chaldeans were unto Job. And thus THE ADVERSARY, in our own language, which answers to Satan, or ὁ διάβολος, is frequently applied to any unfriendly nation. And tho' this remark is anticipated just above, and in the foregoing pages, it

may

may not be improper to recommend it to the reader's particular notice, as it confirms, and is confirmed by, the ſenſe of an able critic on the oriental languages [w], who has endeavoured to prove that the Hebrew article prefixed to the word Satan, in this book of Job, makes it an appellative.

But, after all, it muſt be allowed that the repreſentation, in this caſe, is carried ſomewhat higher than in common caſes; and the reaſons for it are obvious: for Satan, or the Adverſary, was here to be brought into the preſence of the Lord, and to ſpeak with him face to face, that we might, hereby, know why and wherefore Job was afflicted of the Lord: and as it was neceſſary for the conviction of Satan, or the Adverſary, that Job ſhould be viſited by affliction from different quarters, that the elements ſhould conſpire with them to

[w] MICHAELIS — in his Remarks on Dr Lowth's Prelections.

ſtrip him of his ſubſtance, and deprive him of his children, as alſo that he himſelf ſhould be ſmitten with ſore boils; ſo this power was to be committed unto their repreſentative: otherwiſe we ſhould not have known that all this was — becauſe of the Adverſary: and, moreover, there would have been an evident defect in the repreſentation, if any thing or cauſe (apparent or hid) which contributed to Job's fall or affliction, had been excluded from the Idea of *the Adverſary*: for the Adverſary cannot properly be ſaid to do more than the Adverſaries repreſented hereby are able to effect: hence the Idea to be annexed to Satan, in this place, muſt include all thoſe adverſe powers which contributed to the fall, and deep diſtreſs, of this Hero in affliction.

But to form an Idea of the repreſentative independent, or abſtracted from, the repreſented, is of little conſequence: the Adverſaries might have been repreſented by a body of angels or ſpirits aſ- ſuming

ſuming their character: and if we add one who can caſt forth lightnings — another to unbridle the winds — a third to ſmite with boils, there will need no more.

Such a group, however, would ſeem to want a repreſentative, in order to addreſs them as one: and it is much more natural to ſuppoſe that the author has perſonified all Job's Adverſaries in one — who bears upon him the whole of their character — ſpeaks their language — and does their works: and that this perſon might be complete, wanting nothing, he commits the elements, and a power of ſmiting with boils, into his hands. And thus he becomes a perfect repreſentative of all Job's Adverſaries, of what ſort or nature ſoever.

This Being, who is all over of the writer's creation, he names — Satan: The Adverſary. This name is appellative, which ſhews us that it is not to be underſtood of one, but of many — he confeſſes himſelf a ſojourner on earth —

expoſes his character with his own mouth — goes forth, and does that, which the author himſelf, without a figure, declares to have been done by the Adverſaries — or elſe by the finger of God. So that if the writer is now miſunderſtood, it muſt be a difficult matter to guard againſt miſapprehenſion: for the name, or appellation of Satan being, in ſcripture, plainly applied to the Adverſaries or Enemies of the Lord's people, that alone ſhould have been ſufficient to prevent any groſs miſtakes — eſpecially as the ſenſe naturally paſſes to other adverſe powers, that may occaſionally ariſe: and in the preſent caſe we are expreſsly told by what perſons and means Job was ſtript of his ſubſtance and afflicted: conſequently we have nothing more to do, than to extend the Idea of the Adverſary to ſuch perſons and means.

Upon the whole of the matter, we come to this concluſion, viz. that the author of the book of Job, has had recourſe

courſe to perſonification, that he might, by that means, bring Job's Adverſaries into the preſence of God, and by a ſhort dialogue inform us, at once, of the reaſon and end of that man's ſufferings.

This perſonification is judiciouſly managed: there is both elegance and propriety in including ſuch adverſe powers of nature as became Satan unto Job. It contracts the Hiſtory — is perfectly agreeable to the Eaſtern manner of writing, and might be exemplified by many inſtances drawn from the Greek and Latin poets — whoſe chief excellence conſiſts in this ſort of repreſentation [x].

The paſſages we have been conſidering, when underſtood in this light, become a key to the whole book, which would be inſtructive both to the Jew and to the Gentile: the former, being the people of God, might learn from it to endure

x We need but read a few pages in the firſt book of Virgil's Æneiad to be convinced. The council of the Gods, Book X. is grounded on the ſame plan of repreſentation with this in Job.

endure all things for the Lord's ſake — that the Adverſary might be convinced of the integrity of his ſervants, and of his power to deſtroy or to ſave; which power is manifeſted in the deep affliction and ſubſequent exaltation of his ſervant Job: and the latter, the Gentile, or the Adverſaries themſelves, might learn that there was no God like unto the Lord, who bringeth low and raiſeth up — who ſupports his ſervants under affliction, and faileth not to turn the captivity of them who put their truſt in him: and they might learn alſo, that the Lord in mercy and grace to them afflicted his righteous ſervants, that they might *ſee* and *hear* and be converted unto him.

Inſtruction, in this view, riſes from every part of the Hiſtory; and ſo obviouſly that it will not be neceſſary to proceed further in pointing it out. The ſenſe in which the word Satan is now underſtood has drawn a veil over the whole, by introducing an Idea foreign

to

to the matter: and the two passages, wherein the word occurs, instead of serving as a key, have been rendered exceedingly difficult, if not absolutely unintelligible, by the intervention of this wrong Idea. And this alone is a sufficient reason for rejecting it.

But if the received opinion relative to Satan, is not well founded in scripture, and if a different sense hath been clearly made out, it will then follow, that the received notion should be rejected, till we find some good reasons in justification of it. And these, I am pretty certain, will not be found in this book of Job. The personification alone has solved all difficulties: and the writer himself teaches us to consider it in no other light, when, in the subsequent parts of the History, we are expressly told, that *the Lord* brought all this evil upon Job — He himself considers his boils as proceeding from the immediate hand of God: his wife was doubtless of the same persuasion, when she said

"Dost

"Doſt thou ſtill retain thine integrity? "curſe God and die."—His friends argue upon the ſuppoſition that God afflicted him for his ſins—Elihu the ſon of Barachel, who ſpeaks as an oracle of God, ſuppoſes him to be chaſtiſed of the Lord, that he might be made more perfect through ſufferings—The Lord himſelf (Chap. xl. 8.) is introduced, by the author, acknowledging the matter as his judgment—and laſtly all Job's brethren and ſiſters, and all that had been of his acquaintance, came unto him, and bemoaned and comforted him, over all the evil that *the Lord* had brought upon him.

To all this we may yet add, that Elihu, who ſpeaks for the Lord, or the Lord himſelf, doth, in this very book, claim the direction of the lightning and winds, by which Job ſuffered ſo much, and they are ſaid expreſsly to be immediately ſubject to, or under the immediate direction of, the Lord: it is aſſerted alſo, that *he layeth* trouble and affliction upon

upon the loins of men, and chasteneth them: the Lord therefore smote Job with sore boils —— and when it is said that Satan smote him, we cannot allow any more than the personification of a second cause immediately in the hand of God, which became Satan or an Adversary to Job, just as lightning and wind were in the same hand Adversaries unto him in a former case: for to suppose a real separate spirit, studiously set to counteract the will of God, had any concern in these matters, would be taking the reins of government out of the hand of God, and committing them to one who would be sure to make the most perverse use of them ---- and it could never be said that his works were the Lord's doings. Such a notion clogs the history with innumerable difficulties: we are therefore justified in taking up a more obvious sense, which removes all difficulties, and substitutes sound wisdom and instruction in their place.

Here I shall leave the reader to make what

what further reflections he pleases,--- knowing no objections that will lay against the interpretation adopted in the foregoing pages, but such as might be made to the most admired passages in the writings of the best ancient authors ---- and to poetic representation in general. We shall now proceed to,

Psalm cix. 6. where we read "Set "thou a wicked man over him, and "let Satan stand at his right hand." Or as it is elsewhere translated "Set thou "an ungodly man to be ruler over him, "and let Satan stand at his right hand."

It is not clear to me what prevented the translators of our Bible from interpreting the word Satan in this passage: they certainly knew that it signified an Adversary; and if it had been so translated no body would have been at a loss to understand it: for as the devoted person, has a wicked man given him for his ruler, it will be universally allowed, that another may do for his Adversary---- especially

eſpecially when ſet ſo near as "at his "right hand"----ready to reſiſt and moleſt him on all occaſions.

In the Septuagint verſion, the word Satan is tranſlated διαβολος ----without the article: this points out the moſt limited and reſtrained (or, at leaſt, the moſt ſimple) ſenſe of the word: in Engliſh, an Adverſary.

The paſſage is too clear to need enlarging upon: I ſhall therefore only obſerve further—that Adverſaries in matters of legal ſtrife, are ſaid to have ſtood, formerly, at the right hand of the perſon accuſed by them; and if ſo, the phraſe "Let Satan, or an Adverſary, "ſtand at his right hand," may be ſuppoſed to point out ſuch an Adverſary. This will make ſome alteration in the caſe of the devoted perſon: for as a wicked man was to be his ruler, or judge, his circumſtances became more deſperate, when an Adverſary ſtood at his right hand and accuſed him.

ONCE

ONCE more only in our English Bible, doth the word Satan occur. This is in the prophecy of Zechariah, Chap. iii. 1. 2.

We may observe here, that from the 1st to the 6th Chapter, inclusive, is one continued prophecy, relative to the restoration of the Jews, and the rebuilding of the Temple (after the Babylonian captivity) under the conduct of Zerubbabel, the chief ruler of the Jews, and of Joshua the High Priest. The passage to be considered is a part of the prophecy, and runs in the following words.

"And he (i. e. the Lord) shewed me "Joshua the high priest standing before "the Angel of the Lord, and Satan "standing at his right hand to resist (or "to oppose) him. And the Lord said "unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O "Satan, even the Lord that hath chosen "Jerusalem rebuke thee." This is evidently and professedly a prophetic vision —intended, as all such visions were,

to

to figure out ſomething future to be fulfilled in the world.

Joſhua (or Jeſus, as it is in the Greek) the *then* high prieſt, appears in the viſion, and was one of the parties: Satan, or the Adverſary, reſiſted or oppoſed him, and conſequently was another party: but the Lord ſtood with Joſhua, and rebuked the Adverſary.

However, neither Joſhua nor Satan were here, but only their viſionary repreſentatives — called by the names of the perſons they were intended to repreſent. The viſion preſents us with ſcenery only — a mere pictureſque repreſentation, which vaniſhed and diſappeared before the real actors ſtood up, and entered upon their reſpective parts.

We ſuppoſe then, that Joſhua, ſometime or other, had really to do with an Adverſary, or Adverſaries; — that the Lord ſtood with him, and rebuked the oppoſer.

If we turn to the book of Ezra, which contains a ſhort hiſtory of theſe times,

we ſhall find the viſion explained by facts. Chap. v. begins thus, “ Then the pro- “ phets, Haggai the prophet, and Zecha- “ riah the ſon of Iddo, propheſied unto “ the Jews that were in Judah and Jeru- “ ſalem, in the name of the God of Iſ- “ rael — then roſe up Zerubbabel the ſon “ of Shealtiel, and Joſhua the ſon of Joza- “ dak, and began to build the houſe of God “ which is at Jeruſalem, and with them “ were the prophets of God helping them.” — ſtrengthening their hands, at leaſt, with the word of prophecy.

There is no doubt then, but that the prophecy of Zechariah was delivered about this time: Chap. iii. is addreſſed to Joſhua, and Chap. iv. to Zerubbabel, to encourage them in their undertaking; *i. e.* in rebuilding the Temple. Joſhua, however, is forewarned (in the viſion) of an Adverſary whom the Lord would rebuke — as was Zerubbabel alſo in the next chapter.

So Ezra proceeds, and informs us — that “ At the ſame time (*i. e.* whilſt they “ were building) came unto them Tatnai, Go-

"Governour on this side the river, and "Shethar-boznai, and their companions, "and said thus unto them, Who hath "commanded you to build this house, "and to make up this wall? — And what "are the names of the men that make this "building?" In short, they would have made them cease from building, and wrote to Darius for that purpose; but it stands recorded that "The Eye of God "was upon the Elders of the Jews (upon "Joshua more especially, who was high "priest over the House of God) so that "the Adversary or Adversaries could not "cause them to cease till the matter came "before Darius,"— who made a decree, that they should not only suffer the building to go on, but assist the builders with such things as might be needful.

Thus was the prophecy of Zechariah fulfilled. The Lord stood with Joshua, and rebuked the Adversary. The Lord stood, indeed, with his people at large; but as Joshua was at the head of them, in so exalted a station, more particularly

in respect of the temple, so it may properly be said, that the Lord stood with Joshua, under whose conduct the work was carrying on. Not that we are to except Zerubbabel who was prince of the Children of Israel: the Adversaries resisted him, as well as Joshua: and the Lord declared, by the mouth of the same prophet, that his hands had laid the foundation of the house, and that his hands should also finish it — notwithstanding any Adversaries who might oppose him; but as the word of the Lord is directed, separately, to the two chiefs of of the house of Israel; so Joshua *alone* is concerned, in that part of the prophecy, which I am now concerned to explain.

That Satan ought, here, to be understood of Tatnai, who is called Governor on this side the river, of Shethar-boznai, and his companions (Deputy Governors I suppose who acted in conjunction with them) will not admit of any reasonable doubt. 'Tis true any one of them might have been called Satan, when he became

an

an Adverſary; but ὁ Σαλὰν, with the article, or ὁ διάβολος, as in the Septuagint, muſt either be underſtood of ſome eminent Adverſary, or elſe collectively of the Adverſaries: and it is very clear that the ſeventy have underſtood the word of more than one: for we read only of Joſhua and Satan, ſtanding before the Angel of the Lord; and yet the Angel commanded *thoſe who ſtood before him*, to take away Joſhua's filthy garments—and let *them*, ſaid he, ſet a fair mitre upon his head, and they did ſo. This is doubtleſs to be underſtood of Satan or the Adverſary, and was fulfilled, when Darius ſent his decree to theſe Governors, that they ſhould aſſiſt the Jews, out of the King's goods, by allowing them expences out of the tribute beyond the river, and by ſupplying them with ſuch things as they had need of: which decree the Adverſaries [y] were

[y] It ſeems that they were ſeven in number, and that they are the ſeven eyes mentioned *Zech.* iii. 9. and iv. 10. alſo, that Darius was *the ſtone* laid before Joſhua, *the golden candleſtick*,

were obliged to comply with, at their peril. See the decree, *Ezra* Chap. vi.

I ſhall only further obſerve, that prophetic viſions are more or leſs ſtriking, in the reſemblance they have to things ſignified by them, as it hath ſeemed good to the Divine Wiſdom, to convey a clear or obſcure notice of things future. This viſion was for the immediate encouragement of Joſhua, and the figures appearing, are the figures of the very perſons, who would be actors in the buſineſs, of which the prophet ſpoke: it was indeed too clear to be miſtaken —, unleſs you ſuppoſe Satan a mere ſpirit[z]: that indeed will cover the paſſage with darkneſs and myſtery.

We have now gone through the Old Teſta-

dleſtick, and one of the *anointed ones* who ſtood up for the Lord of the whole earth. The ſeven lamps of the candleſtick, the ſeven Princes or Privy Councellors of Darius, and the ſeven pipes to the ſeven lamps, the ſeven deputy Governors, who, tho' once Adverſaries, afterwards aſſiſted the Jews according to the word of the Lord.

[z] If a ſeparate ſpirit only had been rebuked, the Adverſaries might ſtill have impeded the building of the Temple.

Teſtament: the word Satan occurs no more in the Engliſh Bible: and I have, occaſionally, taken notice where, and in what ſenſe, it occurs in the Septuagint; here it is always tranſlated by διάβολος, or ὁ διάβολος, except 1 Kings, xi. 14. How oft it is found in the Hebrew, muſt be left to the examination of thoſe, who are converſant in that language.

It only remains that we ſhould collect the information we have gained, and that we ſhould take it along with us to the New Teſtament.

We have ſeen that the word Satan (or its correſpondent Greek term διάβολος) is applied to ſuch perſons as were adverſaries or enemies of the people of God. Thus Hadad the Edomite, and Rezon the ſon of Eliadah were Satan unto Iſrael all the days of Solomon[a] — and Satan (an Adverſary whoſe name is not mentioned) ſtood up againſt Iſrael, and provoked David to number his men of war[b]. In both

[a] See 1 Kings, xi. 14. Septuagint ver.

[b] 1 Chron. xxi. 1. &c.

both theſe caſes Satan is to be underſtood of *an Adverſary or Enemy at war* with Iſrael. In the time of the captivity, Haman, the ſon of Hammedatha, the Agaggite, was — ὁ διάβολος, the Adverſary of the Jews. This man, under Ahaſuerus King of Perſia and Media, projected a violent perſecution, and thought to have deſtroyed all the children of the captivity[c]. Here *the Adverſary is a Perſecutor* of the people of God, and *one who accuſed* them unto the King under whom they were captive: ſo in the book of Pſalms, where it is written, "Set thou a wicked man "to be ruler over him, and let Satan "ſtand at his right hand[d]."—Satan, the Adverſary, is either a Perſecutor, or, which is more probable, an accuſer — for the right hand of the accuſed was the place of the accuſer. Thus far we may venture to ſay *all is clear*.

Zechariah had a viſion in which the Lord ſhewed him Joſhua the high prieſt, and

c Book of Eſther, Chap. iii. alſo vii. and viii.

d Pſalm cix. 6.

and Satan ſtanding at his right hand. This Adverſary was a perſecutor, or rather, for the reaſon above given, an accuſer. It may I think be admitted that a prophetic viſion is, as much as any other, "A baſeleſs fabric, which vaniſhes — and leaves not a wreck behind." But the interpretation is ſure: and this prophetic viſion was fulfilled — when Tatnai, Shethar-boznai, and his companions reſiſted Joſhua in building the Temple, and ſent an accuſation againſt him and his people to Darius the King[e]. Theſe deputy Governors were really Satan to Joſhua and his people Iſrael: ſo that this viſion is perfectly cleared by facts.

The author of the book of Job has had recourſe to poetic repreſentation, which has in it ſomething of the viſionary caſt, but is well adapted to the purpoſe of inſtruction: a few examples of this kind are found in ſcripture, where the poetic licence is taken in its full extent[f]: and how

[e] Compare Zech. iii. with Ezra v.

[f] See Iſaiah, Chap. xiv. and Ezekiel Chap. xvi. alſo the Lamentations of Jeremiah, &c.

how frequently this is done by the beſt heathen writers, nobody who has read will need to be informed.

In the above-named book, the author has perſonified all Job's adverſaries in one — who is their repreſentative. By this means he has brought Satan into the immediate preſence of God, and made way for the introduction of a ſhort dialogue, by which we are informed that God delivered up his ſervant to affliction, for the conviction and converſion of the Adverſaries, or of Satan. The Adverſary, in this caſe, was the Sabeans and Chaldeans, for whoſe ſake the lightenings and winds became Adverſaries to Job, and he was alſo ſmitten with ſore boils. The repreſentative of the Adverſary has therefore theſe powers committed unto him — partly becauſe it was through them that ſuch powers prevailed againſt Job, and partly becauſe theſe powers did really become Satan, that is adverſaries, to Job, and if no other adverſaries had been concerned there would have been elegance,

but

but no impropriety, in giving them an active repreſentative. This is nothing more than a perſonification of inanimate or latent powers, and is very common with the beſt writers both ancient and modern.

Upon the whole, there is no reaſon to believe, that the word Satan is ever uſed in the old Teſtament, to denote a fallen angel, or a real, evil, ſeparate ſpirit; but there are good reaſons to believe the contrary, for it is clearly proved in many inſtances.

F I N I S.

In the Introductory Remarks, &c. page 4, note e, line 6, *for* Zacharias iv. 4, *read* i. 4. Other errata of leſs moment (which it is hoped are not numerous) the candid reader will readily overlook.

(2)

AN

ATTEMPT

TO PROVE THAT

THE OPINION CONCERNING

THE

DEVIL, OR SATAN,

AS A

FALLEN ANGEL,

AND

THAT HE TEMPTS MEN TO SIN,

HATH

NO REAL FOUNDATION IN SCRIPTURE.

BEING A

SUPPLEMENT to a PAMPHLET

PUBLISHED ABOUT THE YEAR 1770,

1772 [illegible]

ENTITULED,

AN ENQUIRY

INTO THE SCRIPTURE MEANING OF THE WORD

SATAN.

The SECOND EDITION, with considerable Additions.

By WM. ASHDOWNE.

Time, that destroys the fictions of error and opinion, confirms the determinations of nature, and of truth.

CICERO of the nature of the Gods.

CANTERBURY:

PRINTED AND SOLD BY W. BRISTOW;

ALSO SOLD BY JOHNSON, IN ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, LONDON;

TOWNSEND, CHATHAM; LEDGER, DOVER; BURGESS,

LEWES; CHALMERS, MAIDSTONE; AND ALL

OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

[PRICE ONE SHILLING AND SIX-PENCE.]

1794.

D

AN

ATTEMPT, &c.

SECT I.

An Examination of the Passages in the Old Testament, in which the Words DEVILS *and* SATAN *occur, and what is related of him.*

THE first text in which the former word is mentioned is, Liv. xvii. 7. And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto Devils, after whom they have gone a whoring.—That by Devils is meant, the idols or objects of idolatry only, is plain, from Deut. xxxii. 16, 17. They (the Israelites) provoked God to jealousy with their strange gods; they sacrificed unto Devils,* not to God; to gods whom they knew not; to new gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not.

Of Jeroboam, it is related, 2 Chron. xi. 15. That he ordained him priests for the high places, and for the Devils, and for the calves which he had made.—They sacrificed to the calves, 1 Kings, xii. 31, 32. He made other gods and molten images to provoke God to anger. xiv. 9.

In Psal. cvi. 35. 38, it is related of the people of Israel, when they were mingled with the Heathen,

* Dr. Taylor, in his Hebrew Concordance, saith, "It signifies hairy, or a goat, so called from its shaggy hair. The deities worshipped, in Egypt, such as oxen, dogs, wolves, monkeys, goats." It may just be observed, that the word Devil doth not once occur in the Old Testament.

and learned their works, That they ſerved their idols, which was a ſnare unto them; yea, they ſacrificed their ſons and their daughters unto Devils, i. e. to the idols of Canaan. Of the Heathen, the Apoſtle ſaith, The things which the Gentiles ſacrifice, they ſacrifice to Devils; and I would not that ye ſhould have fellowſhip with Devils. 1 Cor. x. 20. viii. 7. 10. Deut. xii. 30, 31. Rev. ix. 20.

The firſt text in which the word Satan occurs, in our tranſlation, is, 1 Chron. xxi. 1. And Satan ſtood up againſt Iſrael, and provoked (or moved David, as the ſame original word is rendered in the next verſe) to number Iſrael; or, as it is worded, 2 Sam. xxiv. 1. Again the anger of the Lord was kindled againſt Iſrael, and he moved David againſt them to ſay, Go, number Iſrael and Judah.*

Whenever the people were numbered, from twenty years old and upwards, each one, whether rich or poor, is commanded to pay half a ſhekel, Exod. xxx. 11, &c. This was to be applied to the ſervice of the tabernacle of the congregation, that it may be a memorial unto the children of Iſrael before the Lord, to make an atonement for their ſouls. But there is not even the leaſt hint in either of the fore-cited chapters, that David intended, or gave any order to Joab to collect the half ſhekel of the people that were numbered. And it is plain, that Joab, his chief General, looked upon the King's command as abominable; and ſaid to him

* Mr. Farmer obſerves, in his Anſwer to Dr. Worthington, p. 53, That the authors of the Septuagint did not imagine there was any reference to Satan in 1 Chron. xxi. i. which they render και ανεςη διαβολος (not Diabolos εν τω ισραελ, and there aroſe an enemy in Iſrael. Even in reference to a good angel, the Hebrew word is tranſlated διαβολη, by the Septuagint, Numb. xxii. 32. which therefore muſt denote oppoſition without malice. In reference to the ſame angel, the Septuagint uſes the verb from which διαβολος is derived.

Why,

Why doth my Lord require this thing? Why will he be a cause of trespass to Israel? And when he and the inferior officers had executed the King's command, at least in part, and returned to him with the list of the men, it appears plain he very soon recollected he had trespassed by not observing the command of God, in Exodus. 1 Chron. xxi. 8. In his confession, mentioned in this chapter, it doth not in the least appear, he perceived in himself that he was tempted by Satan to commit the sin, or that he was moved to it by God; and indeed, as God charged him with the sin, or transgression, we cannot suffer ourselves to admit he was either the sole or partial cause of it.* From David's opposing Joab's judgment and remonstrance against numbering the people, it is evident he was determined upon it from whatever cause it arose.

Farther, it appears from Samuel, just cited, that previous to this, Israel, or the people had sinned, and it provoked God; for, it is said, Again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel. What their former sin was, is not mentioned; but for that, as well as for their present transgression, God punished the people; as is related, 2 Sam. xxiv. 11, &c. David again confessed, that as he alone had sinned, he and and his family only deserved to be punished.

* Though the original word translated "moved," doth in most texts where it occurs, properly signify stirred up, persuaded, or enticed by the influence which one person hath over or upon another, to engage him to act conformable thereto, as appears in these texts, Deut. xiii. 6, 7. Joshua xv. 18, 1 Kings xxi. 25. 2 Chron. xviii. 2. yet it cannot well be admitted in the case under consideration, for as the Apostle James saith, As God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempted he any man. i. e. by any real influence on his mind to excite him to do that which is evil.

Finally, I obſerve, that in the ſacred writings extant, prior to the writing the book of Chronicles, there is not the leaſt mention of any angel being caſt out of Heaven on account of his having ſinned againſt God, as the common opinion of ſuch an apoſtate ſpirit; and therefore the writer of it, by the word Satan, could not intend ſuch a being. Indeed, had any of thoſe writers made mention of ſuch a being, and that he had tempted or provoked any of the people to ſin by his ſecret wiles or ſuggeſtions, there would then be ſome plauſible ground to ſuppoſe that Satan provoked David to number the people: but it is certain they have not, even in a ſingle inſtance. The Satan, or adverſary, that excited him to undertake it, probably was his pride, or ſome other inordinate or criminal deſire; or perhaps, the fear of a formidable enemy. One or other of theſe, it is probable, led him to over-rule the better judgment and expoſtulation of Joab, who was entirely againſt it. That it was his act only, is plain, from his own words. 1 Chron. xxi. 8. 17.

The next text where the word Satan occurs, is in Job. i. 8. and ii. 1. 2. That a fallen angel, or a wicked apoſtate ſpirit is not meant, appears to me, at leaſt highly probable, from the following conſiderations: One is, it is very incredible that the Lord ſhould hold the converſation there related, with ſuch a being, and alſo that he ſhould give him leave to afflict his pious ſervant with the ſore diſorder of the boils merely to gratify the groundleſs and invidious inſinuation or charge of ſuch a wicked ſpirit; that his ſerving God was not from a pious and good principle, but becauſe he had bleſſed him with an abundance; but, that if he endangered his life, he would rebel againſt him. In either view of this relation, it certainly is without any precedent in all the Bible; and, I own, I cannot reconcile the latter

latter part with the many declarations in thofe very writings in which is expreffed God's regard to thofe that ferve him, in like manner as is related of Job's piety to God; his paternal regard for his children's religious welfare and happinefs; and his acts of beneficence manifefted to the neceffitous, related in chap. xxix.

That neither Job, nor his wife believed the boils were inflicted by Satan, as a wicked fpirit, but by the hand of God, is plain, from chap. ii. 9, 10. and from chap. i. 21. it is equally plain he believed that his other afflictions came upon him from God; and from the fpeeches of his friends, it is alike evident that they underftood all his afflictions came upon him by the appointment of God; and after the Lord had bleffed him with a double portion of goods, as chap. xlii. 10, 11. it is faid, Then came there unto him, all his brethren and all his fifters, and all they that had been of his acquaintance before, and they bemoaned over him *all the evils that the Lord had brought upon him*; and, according to the cuftom of that time, and what is fimilar with it at prefent in the Eaftern countries, every man alfo gave him a piece of money, and, every one an ear-ring of gold.

Laftly, I obferve in all that is related of Satan, refpecting Job, there is not the leaft intimation of his infufing into his mind evil thoughts, or exciting in him any inordinate defires, by which he tempted him to fin againft the Lord, either prior to, or after he was afflicted with the boils.

The next text in which the word Satan is mentioned is, Zach. iii. 1, &c. The firft fix chapters appear to contain a revelation by a vifion made to the prophet concerning the Ifraelites, upon their return from the Babylonian captivity, and their building the Temple; and the principal perfons that are mentioned are Jofhua and Zerubbabel.

This

This appears highly probable by consulting the time when the prophet lived and prophesied, and comparing what he says in the context, we are considering with what is related. Ezra v. Then the prophets Haggai, and Zachariah the son of Iddo, prophesied unto the Jews that were in Judea and Jerusalem, in the name of the God of Israel, even unto them. Then rose up Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel, and Jeshua the son of Joszadak, and began to build the house of God which is at Jerusalem, and with them were the prophets of God helping them: i. e. by their prophesying. Their adversaries are thus described: At that time came to them Tatnai, Governor on this side the river; and Shether-boznai, and their companions, and said thus to them: Who hath commanded you to build the house and make the walls? Then said we unto them, after this manner; What are the names of the men that make this building? In short, they would have made them desist from building, and wrote to Darius for that purpose; but it stands recorded thus: The eyes of the Lord were upon the elders of the Jews, so that they, (their adversaries, or Satan) could not cause them to cease till the affair came before Darius, who made a decree, that they should not only suffer the building to go on, but also assist the builders with such things as might be needful.

Another text in which the word Satan occurs, is, Psal. cix. 6. Set thou a wicked man over him, (i. e. mine enemy) and let Satan stand at his right hand.* It is exceeding plain that in the context David is speaking of men who were his enemies, he saith,

* On this verse Dr. Patrick comments, Let the worst man that can be found be appointed to hear his cause when he is accused, and his most malicious adversary plead against him.

For

For my love, they are my adverſaries. But the Hebrew word rendered adverſaries, and alſo in the verſes 20, 29, is the ſame as in verſe 6, tranſlated Satan.* Had the word in the former verſes been tranſlated as in the latter, it would be, They are my Satans. But, I judge, there is no diſcerning man who can believe that the perſons he had mentioned as the wicked, who encompaſſed him about with words of hatred, and fought againſt him, were fallen angels, but men only.

Beſides the foregoing texts where the words Devils and Satan occur, there are others wherein mention is made of an evil ſpirit, that, by ſome perſons, may be interpreted and underſtood to intend a fallen angel, and therefore be urged againſt what I have aſſerted reſpecting the entire ſilence of thoſe writings concerning ſuch a being. Theſe texts will be conſidered, and the firſt I will produce is, 1 Kings, xxii. 21, 22, 23.† The occaſion of the Prophet's mentioning the viſion, is related in the foregoing verſes, which need not be cited. The viſion will be eaſily diſcerned, and alſo allowed to be not a relation of a fact, which then took place, but only a repreſentation made to the Prophet relative to Ahab and Jehoſhaphat's going to beſiege Ramoth Gilead. Farther, it appears to me highly improbable, at leaſt, that the Prophet believed, the ſpirit ſaid, to come forth, or out from among the good angels, who are repreſented as ſtanding be-

* See Taylor's Hebrew Concordance, No. 1928.

† And there came forth a ſpirit and ſtood before the Lord, and ſaid, I will perſuade him, i. e. Ahab. And the Lord ſaid, wherewith? And he ſaid I will go forth and will be a lying ſpirit in the mouth of all his prophets; and he ſaid, thou ſhalt perſuade and prevail alſo, go forth and do ſo. Now therefore behold the Lord hath put a lying ſpirit in the mouth of all theſe thy prophets, and the Lord hath ſpoken evil concerning thee.

fore

fore the throne of God, was intended to repreſent a fallen angel, or apoſtate ſpirit; and, I think it will appear in that light to every one who attends to the paſſage. I judge it will alſo be granted to have been equally improbable to the Prophet, that God ſhould ſend ſuch a being to execute the meſſage there related. That which, in my opinion, is an unanſwerably ſtrong and decided proof of the juſtneſs of the foregoing obſervations, reſpecting the Prophet's opinion of the evil ſpirit not being a fallen angel, is the entire ſilence of the Scriptures, that ſuch a being had been caſt out of Heaven, as I have already obſerved; and it is paſt doubt, that in the viſion there is not the leaſt hint that the evil ſpirit was a repreſentation of one of them.

If it is admitted the viſion was ſubſequent to what is related of the 400 prophets who propheſied to Ahab and Jehoſhaphat, that ſucceſs would attend their beſieging Ramoth Gilead, it is plain, that the former was already perſuaded of the truth of their prediction, particularly by what is ſaid of Zedekiah and the other prophets, v. 11, 12. But ſuppoſing it ſhould be granted that the evil ſpirit who came forth and offered to go and perſuade Ahab repreſents a fallen angel, yet it will not prove there is more than one.

I may ſtill add, that whoever will be at the pains to look at the numerous texts in the Old Teſtament, particularly in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, wherein mention is made of the falſe prophets, will not find the leaſt hint that they were ſtirred up, or excited to propheſy falſely, and thereby deceive the people, by an evil ſpirit, i. e. a fallen angel. But thoſe writings have aſſigned very different and apparent cauſes, from whence they were induced or excited to deceive the people by their propheſying falſe things, as the prophets did we have mentioned.

On

On the whole, there doth not ſeem to be the leaſt proof that the evil ſpirit, mentioned in the viſion, was deſigned to repreſent a fallen angel; or was ſo underſtood by the prophet to whom it appeared.

Another text I ſhall take under conſideration, is, 1 Sam. xvi. 14,* &c. Previous to my offering any obſervations upon it, I judge it will be proper to attend to what is related in chapter the tenth, wherein mention is made of God's ſending Samuel to chooſe Saul, and anoint him to be King over his people. To whom Samuel ſaid, The ſpirit of the Lord will come upon thee, and thou ſhalt propheſy, and thou ſhalt be turned into another man: And after he had turned back from him, God gave him another heart; and when he and his companions came to the hill, a company of the prophets met him, and the ſpirit of God came upon him, and he propheſied among them. Some time after this, God, by Samuel, ſent him to go up againſt Amalick, and utterly deſtroyed it; as it is related chapter xi. but, inſtead of his fully executing this commiſſion, he ſpared Agag, &c. as v. 8, 9. Upon this, Samuel came to him, and, among other things. plainly told him, as v. 22, 23, that, for this act of perverſe diſobedience, God rejected him from being King. Soon after this, Samuel was ſent to anoint David, the ſon of Jeſſe, to be King in his ſtead, which he accordingly did; tho' the commencement of his reign did not take place till the death of Saul. I think there can hardly be any doubt that Saul was informed of David's being anointed King.

Let any one, for a moment, only conſider theſe particular caſes, which, it is natural to believe, very deeply affected the mind of Saul: It was im-

* The ſpirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil ſpirit, from the Lord, troubled him.

bittered with the juſt accuſation of his own inexcuſable guilt; or, in the words of Samuel to him: Rebellion is as the ſin of witchcraft, and ſtubbornneſs is as iniquity and idolatry; thou haſt rejected the word of the Lord in not executing it on the Amaelkites. That God, who had raiſed him up in a very ſingular manner to be the firſt King over his people Iſrael; that he had withdrawn his ſpirit from him by which he had propheſied among the prophets; and, finally, he had, by a ſpecial direction to Samuel, anointed David to be King; and to him he had given his ſpirit. A proper attention to theſe very intereſting particulars, will, I preſume, without any difficulty, explain in what ſenſe we are to underſtand that an evil ſpirit from the Lord troubled him; and alſo the true cauſe from whence his ſervants, who, no doubt, ſaw his unuſual dejection of mind, ſaid to him, Behold! now, an evil ſpirit, from God, troubleth thee. To remove, or mitigate which, they gave him this advice: Let our Lord the King command thy ſervants to ſeek out a man who is a cunning player on a harp, and it ſhall come to paſs, when the evil ſpirit, from God, is upon thee, that he will play with his hand, and thou ſhalt be well. To which propoſal he aſſented; and David was ſent for; and when the evil ſpirit, from God, was upon Saul, he took an harp and played with his hand: So Saul was refreſhed, and was well, and the evil ſpirit departed from him.— The ſucceſs attending the advice of his ſervants, ſhews plainly what was their opinion of the real cauſe, as well as the nature of his trouble.

I preſume it will be allowed there is not the leaſt evidence in the context from whence we may juſtly ſuppoſe, that Saul's ſervants believed the power of the muſical harp could poſſibly expel a fallen angel from Saul, had they underſtood it to be ſuch a being

being. But it was not an improper expedient to relieve his mind, under its present disordered state; especially if we may suppose that he was rather fond of that kind of music.

Men, in common, and even very sensible men too, through the force of habit, are very apt to affix to the words evil spirit, they find in Scripture, the idea of a fallen angel; and then incautiously conclude that those writers used them in the same sense; but this is often, as in the case before us, a very capital error, as, I presume, will appear more fully in the following pages.

There is another text in Judges chapter ix. 23. where it is said, God sent an evil spirit between Abimelech and the men of Shechem. After the death of Gideon, the father of Abimelech, he applied to the men of Shechem to obtain their consent, that, as one of his sons, he might rule over them in his stead; but that he might not have any competitor in the family of Jerubbaal his brother, who had sixty sons, he obtained money out of the house of Baal-berith, with which he hired vain and light persons, and by these he slew them all, except Jotham, the youngest, who escaped from that unnatural and unprovoked massacre. Upon this, the Shechemites made him King. As they in general were not concerned in that wicked act, Jotham addressed them to retaliate it upon Abimelech and those who were concerned with him; as v. 7—20. After Abimelech had reigned three years, it is said God sent an evil spirit, &c. I think it is probable that the Shechemites, who were not concerned with him, in consequence of Jotham's expostulation, meditated revenge against him and his adherents, and therefore commenced hostilities against him; upon which Abimilech, with his forces, went against Shechem, and slew many of the people; after which he attacked

Thebez, and took it; but, upon his attempt upon the tower, he was ſlain. Upon his death, it is ſaid, verſes 56, 57, Thus God rendered the wickedneſs of Abimelech, which he did unto his father, in ſlaying his brethren; and for all the evil of the men of Shechem did God render upon their heads, and upon them came the curſes of Jotham, the ſon of Jerubbaal.

From this relation, it appears plain, to me, that by an evil ſpirit is not to be underſtood a fallen angel; but, that God, in the courſe of his Providence, raiſed, or ſtirred up an enemy to Abimelech and his adherents: as, verſes 56, 57. to puniſh them for the wicked act of ſlaying the ſons of Jerubbaal his brother, who had rendered ſignal ſervices to his people againſt their enemies in the time of Gideon their father.

Another text is in Pſalms lviii. 49, where, it is ſaid, God caſt upon them (the Egyptians) the fierceneſs of his wrath and indignation, by ſending evil angels. I would juſt obſerve that the Hebrew word here rendered angels, is often and juſtly tranſlated Meſſengers, and ſometimes Prophets, who, from God, delivered his meſſages to his people; and therefore the word Angels, doth, by no means, always intend angels as inviſible ſpirits, much leſs fallen angels. This can be determined only by the context, or parallel paſſages. Now, it is indiſputably, plain, in the context, the writer gives a ſummary account of God's dealings with the Egyptians, as is particularly recorded in Exod. vii. to the xiii. But, it is certain, that Moſes hath not mentioned evil angels being ſent among the Egyptians. The only angels, or meſſengers he hath related whom God ſent among them, were himſelf and Aaron, by whoſe inſtrumentality God caſt upon them the fierceneſs of his wrath, &c. and in this ſenſe, to the Egyptians they were evil angels,

or

or meſſengers. Now, I think, it will be granted, that the Pſalmiſt could not derive any knowledge of evil angels, i. e. apoſtate ſpirits, being ſent among the people of Egypt, but from the Hiſtory of Moſes, in which there is not even any hint of ſuch beings ſent among them.

I here beg leave to obſerve, that whatever real knowledge men have of angels, i. e. their intellectual powers, or their viſible communications with men, or their being the agents of God in his providential government in this world, that it is wholly derived from divine revelation, without which it is abſolutely impoſſible they can have the leaſt knowledge of either; and the reaſon is as obvious as it is unqueſtionably true, viz. becauſe they are the inhabitants of the inviſible world. And this is equally true, as it reſpects any of thoſe beings having ſinned againſt God, and on that account expelled from Heaven. But, even ſuppoſing that was clearly revealed, yet that would be no proof of their tempting men to ſin, by ſuggeſting to their minds evil thoughts, or raiſing in them corrupt deſires, terminating in ſinful actions. A real knowledge of theſe things muſt depend upon revelation, or a relation of real facts in proof of it. But of theſe things the Old Teſtament is entirely ſilent, as we have ſeen.*

Thus much concerning what we find in the Old Teſtament.

* Mr. Farmer's opinion is this,—That the Old Teſtament contains no account of the fall of angels, much leſs does it repreſent them as ſcaling Heaven, and being thrown down from thence. There is not even the moſt diſtant reference, or alluſion to ſuch an event in any of the Jewiſh prophets. Farther, he ſaith, I am far from taking upon me to ſay there was not an early revelation of the rebellion of angels, and their expulſion from Heaven. But hitherto this point has been aſſerted only,—not proved.

SECT.

SECT II.

I will now examine the New Testament to see whether any thing occurs therein to corroborate the commonly received opinion of Fallen Angels, or Satan and the Devil.

THE only texts, or at least the principal ones, are, in 1 Pet. ii. 4. and Jude v. 6. For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to Hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgement. And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitations, he hath reserved in everlasting chains of darkness unto the judgement of the great day.

On these words I observe, first, That none of the Apostles could derive the least knowledge from the Old Testament, that any of the angels had been cast out of Heaven on account of their having sinned against God; and we have no account that Jesus made any discovery of it to them.

Secondly, Had Peter, or Jude, known, from the Old Testament, or from Jesus, that there were *fallen angels*, it is natural to suppose they would have been explicit in mentioning them to the persons they wrote to, otherwise they could not have understoood what beings they intended; and that for reasons already offered.

Thirdly, Neither of the particulars just mentioned, can be satisfactorily inferred from the word Angels. The primary import of the original word is, to relate any matter, particularly as a messenger,

ger, and in this ſenſe, the ſame original word is rendered, James ii. 25. Theſe meſſengers were ſent to ſpy the interior parts of the land of Canaan; and, upon their return, they related to Moſes and to the people what they had ſeen and heard in traverſing it. And there is but one text where the original word can in the leaſt be ſuppoſed to allude to fallen angels, and that is Matt. xxv. 41.

Fourthly, That the word ταρταρωσ, tranſlated caſt down to Hell, is the only place in the New Teſtament where it is tranſlated caſt down to Hell.

Fifthly, All that the two Apoſtles have related of the conduct of the angels, is, that they ſinned, and kept not their firſt eſtate, or principality, but left (not were caſt out of) their own habitation; where that was is not mentioned.

Of the puniſhment, it is ſaid they were caſt down to Hell, and delivered into chains of darkneſs to be reſerved unto judgment of the great day. But there is not the leaſt mention what their ſinful conduct was, nor that they were caſt out of Heaven and ſeparated from the good angels.

Let us now ſee whether the context in Peter favors the commonly received opinion or not.

In the foregoing chapters he ſaith to his brethren, that he and the apoſtles who were with the Lord on the Mount, Matt. xvii. 1, &c. heard a voice from Heaven, ſaying, this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleaſed. He then adds, That we have a more ſure word of propheſy, i. e. a more particular and full revelation in the Old Teſtament concerning Jeſus as the Son of God, which ye will do well to give heed to, becauſe thoſe writings were indited by the Holy Ghoſt; and the meaning of thoſe parts of them, reſpecting Jeſus, are not confined to the prophets, or that people; but we alſo

alſo are included therein: And then he tells them, that in the time of thoſe prophets, there were falſe ones among that people; and there are, or will ariſe, falſe teachers among you, who will propagate falſe doctrines, even denying the Lord that bought them, and draw away many after them, and thereby bring upon themſelves ſwift deſtruction. And he deſcribes the way or manner by which they will attempt to draw them away. And from v. 10—19, I think he repreſents their principle and conduct; and againſt ſuch falſe prophets Jeſus warned his diſciples, Matt. vii. 15. 26. 29. xxiv. 11. Mark xiii. 21, 22, 23. See Acts xx. 30. And I apprehend the Apoſtle St. John alluded to ſuch perſons. 1 [redacted] iv. 1, 2, 3, calling them Anti-Chriſts, i. e. oppoſers or enemies of Chriſt.

In the chapter under conſideration, the Apoſtle warns the Chriſtians to be aware of them that they might not fall under the ſame condemnation which would overtake thoſe falſe teachers. And in verſe 4, he mentions others, whom he calls angels, or meſſengers that ſinned, &c.

The opinion of a very ſenſible anonymous author* on this ſubject, appears to me at leaſt very probable, that the angels, i. e. the meſſengers that ſinned, are thoſe men related Numb. xiii. xiv. who were ſent to ſpy out the land of Canaan, whoſe report to Moſes, &c. of the numbers and ſituation of ſome of its inhabitants, and the ſtrength of their cities, diſcouraged the people from going up to take poſſeſſion of it. Theſe were rulers and heads of the people whom God puniſhed for giving ſuch an account, by inflicting on them a great plague, ſo that they and all the people whom they cauſed to murmur againſt God, and Moſes his ſervant, died.

* An Enquiry into the Scripture meaning of the word Satan.

Heb.

Heb. iii. 7. 19. Both the meſſengers and the people had ſeen the mighty power of God exerted in their deliverances and yet they did not believe, but rebelled. Thoſe meſſengers who ſinned, were plain and pertitent examples of men like themſelves, from whom they might and ought to take warning not to be ſeduced by the falſe teachers, and thereby be guilty of a like unbelief, i. e. in Jeſus their Lord, and a wicked departure from his commands, which, from conviction they had embraced, and on that account, fall under an heavier condemnation and judgment from God, than he had inflicted on thoſe meſſengers and the people ſeduced by them. But, I apprehend, that if we underſtand the paſſage we are commenting upon, of fallen angels, it was neither applicable, nor indeed intelligible to the apoſtles, or the people to whom he was writing, ſince they had no knowledge that any of the angels had ſinned, or wherein it conſiſted; and, I may add, if they had, what was the conduct of angels, (properly ſuch) to them?

The other inſtances are clearly taken from men like themſelves; the probability therefore is, that theſe were of the ſame nature with thoſe, who, in the time of Noah, God drowned by a deluge; and then he introduces the ſimilar conduct of the inhabitants of Sodom, &c. whom God deſtroyed by fire. But, as a contraſt to theſe, he mentions the caſes of Noah and Lot, who believed in God, and obeyed his word, and were ſaved from thoſe judgments. Theſe, and the former perſons, were obvious examples of men of the like paſſions with themſelves, which they could not only eaſily underſtand, but alſo eaſily apply the former as warnings, and the latter as encouragements to fortify their minds againſt thoſe falſe teachers; but, I apprehend, they could not, as it reſpected fallen angels.

What force these observations will be admitted to have, as proofs, that by the word Angels that sinned, &c. the Apostle did not intend fallen angels, but the rulers and heads of the people, mentioned above, is submitted to the deliberate and unbiassed judgment of the reader.

In the preceding quotations from the Old Testament, where the words Devils and Satan, &c. occur, it appears to me, there is not any proof that the writers in using them, meant fallen angels; and therefore they do not give the least account that Satan, in a secret or unperceived manner, infused, or put into the mind or heart of any one man, evil thoughts, or excited in him inordinate desires, by which he tempted him to sin. Likewise, in the New Testament it appears, that there is not any explicit relation that any of the angels were expelled Heaven for their having sinned against God.

It will therefore follow, that in the former writings in which it is recorded of individuals, or of the people in general who sinned against God by violating the obligations of natural or revealed religion, or both; they have not, even in a single instance, attributed to the temptation of Satan. In this they are as entirely silent as they are respecting any man's being possessed by one of them, or by a demon; and yet had Satan been the real agent, or instrument in tempting men to sin in like manner; or, as universally as it is now believed he doth, I think it will be allowed to be natural to expect the writers of the Old Testament would have given some plain account of it, in some instances; for it is certain they repeatedly mention many different causes or occasions from whence men were tempted to sin; but, it is certain, they have not attributed it to Satan in a single instance. From those writings therefore it seems to be indisputably certain, that

that neither the Apostles nor the Jews could derive the least information concerning Satan or his devices; or, that any person, much less men in general, had been tempted by him to sin.

Should it be said, that the relation given of the Serpent's tempting Eve, and seducing her to sin, is a proof that an individual at least, is an exception; I answer, that, admitting it was by a fallen angel who assumed the bodily shape of that creature, or entered into one, (of which however there is not the least mention in the Bible) yet the relation of his tempting her was, by conversing with her, and not by his infusing in an invisible or unperceived manner into her mind or heart, evil thoughts, or raising evil desires in her, as is now believed to be the way or manner by which he tempts men to sin; consequently the former essentially differs from the latter. And, I suppose there is not any man who will plead that Satan tempts men after that manner. Her being tempted, as is related, I should therefore apprehend cannot justly be urged as a real or satisfactory proof of Satan's tempting men to sin. In what conspicuous light must the difference appear between the sacred writings and those of other men in the present and past ages who lived under the light of the Christian religion, which are replete with *assertions* that a fallen angel assumed the shape of a real serpent, or entered into one; and that he tempted her and her posterity to the commission of the sins which they have been guilty of, or at least, to the principal part of them.

But was the commonly received opinion that it was a fallen angel entered into the serpent, proved to be justly founded in the plain language of Scripture, which it certainly is not, yet that could not prove there is more than one as a tempter of men to sin? And, I may justly remark, there is not even

a ſingle text in the New Teſtament where the word *Devils* is to be found. The only one from whence it may ſeem to be inferred is, Matt. xxv. 41. where Jeſus ſpoke of the Devil and his angels. For, in every other text where the word Devils occurs, it it is Daimonia, and not Diabolos. The only text where the laſt word hath a plural meaning is, 1 Tim. iii. 11. 2 Epiſtle iii. 3. Titus ii. 3. and is rendered ſlanderers and accuſers.

Likewiſe wherever the word Satan is mentioned in the New Teſtament, except Matt. xii. 26. it is in the ſingular only, and there it can include two Satans only; alſo where the words the Prince of this world, the Prince of the power of the air, occur, it is in the ſingular only. The ſame is true of the words, the Power of Darkneſs. When in Luke xi. 18. Jeſus repeating what the Jews ſaid of him, that he caſt out Devils; the original word is Diamonia, a word of very different ſignification from Diabolos, or Satanas.

If the common opinion that there are numerous Satans, or Devils, is pleaded for, it certainly cannot be proved from any expreſſions either in the New Teſtament or in the Old; becauſe thoſe writings invariably uſe the word Devil, or Satan, in the ſingular, and never in the plural number as importing there are many ſuch beings; and I will juſt note, that in all the converſations the Jews had with Jeſus, they do not even once make uſe of the words Diabolos, i. e. Devil, or Satanas.

The firſt relation, in the New Teſtament, of Satan, or the Devil tempting any one, is that of Jeſus. Matt. iv. 1—11. Mark i. 11, 12. Luke iv. 1—13. Matthew and Luke relate, he was led up of the ſpirit into the Wilderneſs to be tempted of the Devil, and mark that the ſpirit driveth him into the Wilderneſs; and when he had faſted forty

days

days and forty nights, he was afterwards an hungred. The particulars related of Satan's tempting Jesus is, his saying, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread; i. e. to supply you with food. His taking him up upon a pinnacle or battlement of the Temple, and saying to him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down from hence, for it is written, he, (i. e. God) shall give his angels charge concerning thee; and in their hands they shall hold thee up, lest, at any time, thou dash thy foot against a stone. His taking him up on an exceeding high mountain, and shewing him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; and saying, All these things will I give thee, and the glory of them, if thou wilt fall down and worship me; for they are delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give it.

I would just premise, that a person may be said to be tempted when an offer is made of what is agreeable to him, or when it excites in him some desire to accept of it; or when, as the apostle James saith, he is tempted, being drawn away of his own lust, and enticed, and thereby it bringeth forth sin.

Now, suppose it is admitteed that Satan is a fallen angel, and that what he said to Jesus is to be literally understood; yet, I think it cannot be doubted but he knew who he was, and his design and end in tempting him. I should therefore judge that no man can really believe the proposals were agreeable to him, much less that they raised in him a desire to comply with either of them; and, as to the last, it is certain, that both Satan and Jesus well knew it was not in Satan's power to give him them had Jesus complied with the condition. On what real ground then can it be justly supposed, that if

Satan knew he was the Son of God, he could have the leaſt reaſon to believe or expect he could tempt him to comply with either propoſal.

Indeed, if we may judge of this temptation as a true ſpecimen of the artful wiles of Satan, (I mean if there is ſuch a being) it certainly doth not evidence his abilities in tempting men to be ſuperior to thoſe of men; or, that he is a much more ſubtle and powerful tempter; for, had he, in either of thoſe reſpects, been ſuperior to men, I think we may juſtly conclude, that his tempting Jeſus would have been much more artfully laid and conducted, and therefore more likely to have ſucceeded than in what is related by the Evangeliſts. I would finally obſerve, they have not given the leaſt intimation, that Satan, in an inviſible manner, unperceived by Jeſus, infuſed into his mind any evil thoughts, or raiſed in him any inordinate deſires to tempt him, as the means by which moſt men believe he tempts perſons to ſin.

The next relation of the Devil, or Satan's tempting, I will mention, is that of Judas. John xiii. 2. 27. it is ſaid, That, ſupper being ended, the Devil now put into the head of Judas Iſcariot to betray Jeſus; or, that after ſupper he gave him the ſop, when Satan entered into him. When he had taken it, he immediately went out, or he went his way, and communed with the chief prieſts, and ſaid to them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they were glad, and covenanted with him for thirty pieces of ſilver, and he promiſed and ſought opportunity to betray him unto them in the abſence of the multitude. Luke xxii. 3—6.

I muſt again intreat the reader to conſider, that neither John nor Luke could have received, from the Old Teſtament, the leaſt knowledge of Satan

as a fallen angel, or of his having put into the heart of any man evil thoughts, by which he tempted him to ſin; or, that he ever entered into any one to effect it. Neither is there any proof, in the evangeliſts, that they had received from Jeſus the laſt knowledge of either; and, and indeed, this is the only account, in the Bible, of Satan's having entered into any man. For all the inſtances recorded in the New Teſtament of men's being poſſeſſed by an evil ſpirit, or ſpirits, are, of a demon, or demons, and not by Satan as a fallen angel.

Farther, I obſerve, that in every paſſage in the Evangeliſts in which Jeſus mentioned to his apoſtles, or to Judas, his being betrayed by one of them, he did not give them the leaſt intimation that he would be tempted to it by Satan, much leſs by his entering into him as the real cauſe of it.

If we impartially attend to what John has related of his principle and conduct, chap. xii. 6. that he cared not for the poor, and being purſe-bearer, he uſed to pilfer what was in bank; as the original words are rendered by another tranſlator: and likewiſe that Jeſus ſaid he is a devil, i. e. an adverſary or accuſer, and not clean, like the reſt of the apoſtles; xiii. 11. and his covenanting with the chief prieſts for thirty pieces of ſilver, to betray him. It is probable we ſhall be led to underſtand John's and Luke's words, cited above, not in the literal ſenſe, but only as expreſſive of Judas's principle and conduct as a very covetous man and an adverſary to Jeſus, who was then going to execute his deſign; and it is reaſonable to believe, he previouſly knew the chief prieſts had ſought to take and deſtroy Jeſus. Luke ſays, Judas ſought to betray him unto them, in the abſence of the multitude, and therefore he came in the night, with the officers,

cers, to take him: and the Evangelists have related that the chief priests, &c. before that time had attempted to take him, but they did not, fearing the people.

How far these observations may be admitted to explain and also to ascertain the true meaning of the words under consideration, is submitted to the judgment of the inquisitive and candid reader. In my view, they appear the most probable salutation of them; at least the literal meaning seems to be attended with considerable, if not with insuperable difficulties, especially that of Satan's entering into Judas.

The next account of Satan I will mention, is that respecting Peter. Luke xxii. 31, 32. Jesus said to him, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat, i. e. separate you from me, like as that grain is from the chaff, not to be united to me again. But he added, I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, i. e. in producing a final separation from me; understanding literally, that Satan desired to have Peter for the purpose expressed in the text, it is very natural to ask to whom it was communicated? I presume we cannot well suppose it was to Jesus, because, prior to any effect it could have upon Peter, Jesus had prayed for him that his faith might not fail him in the sense just mentioned. If Satan's desire was not divulged, it could operate only in himself; but if it excited him to sift Peter, yet his Lord's praying for him would render his tempting him as ineffectual as what is related of his tempting Jesus; and if, as is generally believed, that Satan knows the thoughts and actions of men, he could not but know of Jesus's interposing in favor of his favorite disciple, and therefore that any attempt upon him must prove abortive.

The

That Peter's faith failed him to a great degree, is manifest in the Evangelists: but, in attending to what they have related as the apparent cause, or occasion of it, we shall plainly discern it arose from a different adversary than Satan; that is, from his own natural fear of being involved as a disciple of Jesus in the condemnation, &c. which he saw it was very probable would befall him from the hatred of the high priests, &c. against him when he was present at his trial, and heard him accused of being a malefactor and seditious person, and likewise charged with having designs against Cæsar's government, by assuming to himself the title of King of the Jews, and himself openly accused as an accomplice with Jesus.

This view of the cause of Peter's faith failing him, clearly explains and accounts for it as the adversary or Satan that occasioned it. If Satan was the real cause of his faith failing him, it must be attributed to his exciting his fear lest he should suffer with Jesus; but of this there is not the least intimation in either of the evangelists, nor as it respects the rest of the apostles, who, as well as he, said, they would not deny him even unto death; but it is plain their faith failed them as well as Peter's. That which is peculiar to him is, his thrice denying him at his trial, as is particularly related. And it is evident the evangelists have not given the least hint that Satan stirred up or tempted the high priests, &c. to act the part they did to Jesus, that occasioned Peter's fear, and which led him to deny his Lord. The true and apparent causes or occasions of the high priests, &c. proceedings against Jesus are clearly related by the evangelists, and which began to take place long before his trial; for prior to that time the Pharisees, &c. on several occasions attempted to

take him and put him to death, as is related in their writings. I may farther obſerve, that in every text in which is related Jeſus told his diſciples, or Peter in particular, that they would deny him thro' the weakneſs of their faith, alluding to the time when it took place; he did not give them the leaſt hint it would ariſe from the inſtigation of Satan on their mind. They could not have any real ground to believe this, becauſe, as I have obſerved, there is not the leaſt proof, either in the Old Teſtament, or the words of Jeſus, ſo far as we are capable of judging, from which they could know there was a fallen angel, or that he tempted men to ſin.

Having attempted to explain the paſſages wherein are related Satan's tempting Jeſus and the two apoſtles, I will crave the reader's attention to what our Lord ſaid in ſome of his parables of the wicked one, Satan, or the Devil, as tempting men; and the firſt inſtance is that of the ſower who ſowed the good ſeed in his field. Matt. xiii. Mark iv. Luke vii. of the ſeed that was ſown by the highway, he ſaid, When one heared the word of the kingdom and underſtandeth it not, or hath not an honeſt and good heart, then cometh the wicked one and catcheth or taketh away that which was ſown in his heart; or when they have heard, Satan cometh immediately and taketh away the word that was ſown in their hearts. Satan's tempting theſe perſons is repreſented to be his taking away the word out of their heart; but not by his inſtilling, or putting into it evil thoughts, or raiſing in it evil deſires. And it is unqueſtionably certain, that the above account differs from all other inſtances related in the New Teſtament, where he is ſaid to tempt men. The perſons above deſcribed in the parable, I think are plainly alluded to, and repre-

ſented

ſented verſes 13, 14, 15, as dull of hearing, having cloſed their eyes, leſt at any time they ſhould ſee with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and ſhould underſtand with their heart, and ſhould be converted, and I ſhould heal them; which plainly accounts for the word that was ſown in their hearts not abiding there.

In the parable of the man who made a great ſupper, Luke xiv. 15, &c. as ſomewhat ſimilar in our Lord's intention with that juſt conſidered; he hath explicitly aſſigned other and very different cauſes why the perſons invited to it did not accept of the invitation than that of Satan's tempting them: They are theſe, They all began to make excuſe; the firſt ſaid, I have bought a piece of ground, and I muſt needs go and ſee it; I pray thee have me excuſed.—And another ſaid, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to prove them; I pray thee have me excuſed.—And another ſaid, I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come. So the ſervant came and ſhewed his lord all theſe things. Theſe cauſes why the word did not abide in their hearr, are ſimilar with thoſe Jeſus aſſigned why the ſeed that was ſown on ſtony ground, and on that where the thorns grew up and choaked it, viz. when tribulation ariſeth, becauſe of the word, and by and by they are offended; or the care of this world and the deceitfulneſs of riches, and the luſts of other things, and pleaſures of this life, enter in and choak the word, and he beareth no fruit. Theſe obvious and uſual occaſions of temptation to the perſons repreſented in thoſe parables, the people preſent could eaſily underſtand, and alſo apply it uſefully to themſelves; but they could not as it reſpects the ſecret ſuggeſtions of Satan, or the Devil.

And, in the courſe of Jeſus's Miniſtry, he mentioned many other cauſes why men did not receive the word than in thoſe parables, as muſt be obvious to every one who reads with attention his diſcourſes to the people who attended him. Thus, when he ſaid to ſome of the unbelieving Jews.—How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and ſeek not the honour that cometh from God only?

I will juſt ſubjoin the following texts, in which he hath particularly mentioned ſeveral other evident cauſes of men's being tempted not to receive the word, that may be compared to thoſe repreſented by the highway, without giving the leaſt intimation of the wicked one taking away the word out of their heart. Luke xiii. 24. xiv. 25—35.

But what juſt or ſatisfactory proof is there to be given why it ought to be believed that Satan tempts men by taking away the word out of the heart of thoſe Jeſus compared to the highway on which the ſeed was ſown, leſt they ſhould believe and be ſaved, and yet not tempt or draw away thoſe who have received the word with joy; and where, for a time, it promiſed fair for bringing forth fruit? For it is undeniable, that Jeſus did not attribute it to the temptation of Satan, but to other manifeſt and common temptations to men, which cannot but be admitted, and which his hearers could eaſily underſtand; but, I preſume, they could not, as it reſpected Satan as a fallen angel, for reaſons and proofs already offered. The adverſary to the ſeveral perſons above repreſented, were the things of this world, ſuch as Jeſus mentioned, which too ſtrongly operated upon the heart of ſome of them, as reaſons why the word did not take any root in it: or why they did not accept of the invitation to the

the ſupper; and of others, who received it with joy, yet did not bring forth fruit to perfection; or, in the expreſſive words of Jeſus, reſpecting the man who brought forth fruit, They had not an honeſt and good heart.

The conduct of the men, compared to the ſeed ſown by the highway, is affectingly exemplified in what is related of the young man, Mark x. 17—27. who aſked Jeſus what he ſhould do to inherit eternal life? His riches, and the thought of parting with them as a condition thereto, made him go away without receiving the leaſt benefit from the ſeed Jeſus ſowed in his heart.

A parable ſimilar with the foregoing is contained in v. 24—30. This Jeſus explained to his diſciples, v. 36—43. in which is contained theſe things; The field is the world, i. e. all men, both Jews and Gentiles, as v. 41. The ſeed ſown repreſents the children of the kingdom, i. e. his diſciples, called the righteous; v. 43, who are contradiſtinguiſhed from the world, or the tares; or thoſe who offend and do iniquity. The tares are deſcriptive of the latter perſons, and are called the children of the wicked one, or the Devil, or the enemy who ſowed tares among the wheat. The former are the good ground, which brought forth good fruit.

If we were to interpret our Lord's words of the tares, literally, as the children of the wicked one, or the Devil, it would lead us to conclude it was wholly owing to his temptations and their influence, in cauſing them to offend and do iniquity, which cannot well be reconciled with, and admitted, by thoſe who pay a proper attention to what he hath ſaid of the cauſes or occaſions of men being guilty of iniquity contained in theſe texts, Matt. xii. 34, &c. xv. 18, &c. xxiii. 1. &c.

Luke xi. 37, &c. Mark vii. 5, &c. Luke vi. 43, &c. John iii. 19, 20, 21. xii. 42, 43. In these passages it is very apparent that he attributes the wickedness, or iniquity of men to the influence which their different passions and inordinate desires have on their mind in producing their criminal dispositions and conduct, without giving the least intimation to those he addressed, that either or both arose from the temptations of the Devil, as an invisible apostate spirit. And similar with what he hath represented is that of the apostle, Rom. i. ii. iii. vi. respecting both Jews and Gentiles, who were all under sin, or they yielded their members, instruments of unrighteousness unto sin. This corrupt principle and conduct he calls the old man, which is corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts. Contrasted with the old man which they had put off, is the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. The apostle personifies sin as the old man; but no rational man can well believe that he intended a real person, and that they had actually put him off or expelled him from them, but only that they had forsaken those sins which he stiles the old man. In like manner he is to be understood of the new man they had put on. From our Lord's words just quoted, and those of the Apostle, I think we may with an high degree of probability, at least conclude he did not intend a fallen angel, as the enemy, but the wicked conduct of ungodly men.

The observations made upon the foregoing passages in Matthew, may possibly assist us in explaining another. John vii. 44. Jesus said to the Jews, ye are of your father the Devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie,

he

he ſpeaketh of his own, for he is a liar, and the father of it. In verſe 34, he ſaid, whoſoever committeth ſin is the ſervant of ſin. In theſe words he perſonifies ſin, calling it their maſter, and they his ſervants or ſlaves; in like manner as Paul repreſents the Romans before their converſion. chap. vi. He then changes the perſon to that of father, ſaying, Ye do that which ye have ſeen with your father; or, ye do the deeds of your father, v. 41. As he hath perſonified ſin as their maſter, and alſo their father, whoſe deeds they did, from whence they became ſervants of the former, or children of the latter, by imitation." It ſurely cannot be judged to be offering violence to, or unjuſtifiably ſtraining the ſenſe of the word Devil, to ſuppoſe by that word he perſonified ſin as their father, by doing his luſts, or deeds. I cannot well omit obſerving, that when the apoſtle mentioned Eve's tranſgreſſion. 2. Cor. xi. 3. he did not ſay it was occaſioned by the Devil's tempting her, but that it was by the ſubtilty of the ſerpent, as in Geneſis. And it is undeniable that there is not one text in the Bible in which mention is made of her being tempted by the Devil; i. e. a fallen angel.

That by their father, v. 38, Jeſus did not mean the Devil, v. 44. ſeems pretty plain, from his ſaying, They did that which they had ſeen with their father. But, I preſume, there is no man that believes they had ſeen the deeds of the Devil as a murderer and a liar. When Jeſus repreſents the Jews he was ſpeaking to as the children of the Devil, or that he was their father, he does not impute it to his ſecret viles or inſtigation in their hearts, no more than in verſes 38. 41. After a like manner of expeſſion he ſaid to them, If ye were the children of Abraham ye would do the works of Abraham. But, I imagine, there is no man who be-

believes he intended, that if they had done his works it would have been by the influence of his secret suggestions in their heart. But only that if they had heard and obeyed his word, like as Abraham did the Revelations which God made to him, they would have been his children. See Rom. iv. 11, 12, 16.

To the Jews Jesus said, Matt, xxiii. 31. Ye are witnesses to yourselves that ye are the children of them that killed the prophets. Or, as he saith, Luke xi. 48. Truly ye bear witness that ye allow the deeds of your fathers, for they indeed killed them, and ye build their sepulchres. But, I apprehend there is no man who believes that they were witnesses it was owing to the secret instigations or influence which those wicked men had on their minds which led them to act the part he accused them of; but his meaning is as in the other passage, that their principles and conduct were similar with those murderers of the prophets, and which the Jews afterwards manifested towards him, which he has described in the parable. Matt. xxi. 33. 38.*

I would

* When in Acts xi. 9, 10, the Apostle characterizes Barjus as a child of the Devil, perhaps it is not easy to determine whether he intended that of sorcery alone, or included his other wicked principles and conduct he accused him of; or whether he attributes the latter as the effect of the former. If he intended that first mentioned, I presume it will be attended with insuperable difficulty in explaining how or after what manner an invisible spirit instructed him in the art of sorcery, and the practice of it, so as for him to know that he received it from him. In the relation of the conversation which Peter had with Simon the sorcerer, chap. viii. he doth not give the least hint either that he was taught the art by the Devil, or that what he said to him of his heart not being right in the sight of God, and that he was in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity, arose from the influence or power the Devil had over him. Yet, as these two characters are considerably similar, it is some-

I would further obſerve, that as Jeſus did not in any of the foregoing texts explain to his apoſtles or the Jews, his meaning of the word Satan, or the Devil, i. e. whether he was a fallen angel or not, they could not know he intended ſuch a being, for reaſons I have before offered; and, it is remarkable, that the text in John vii. 44. is the only one in which he attributed the principle and conduct of the unbelieving Jews towards himſelf to the Devil. For, in his numerous, ſevere, and pointed reproofs of them, he aſcribed it to their corrupt hearts and wicked conduct, which they had too long manifeſted in their not keeping the law of God; or, as he tells them, had they believed Moſes, they would have believed him; but, as they did not, they withſtood the united and inconteſtible evidences he gave them, that he was the Son of God, and therefore they ought to obey his word. Muſt it not, therefore, to an attentive

ſomewhat to be expected the Apoſtle would have attributed one or both to the ſame Being as Paul has done; I may juſt obſerve, that in every account we have in the Old Teſtament of ſorcerers, and the kindred arts, there is not the leaſt intimation that they received the knowledge of either from the Devil, or after what manner to practiſe them.

If we ſuppoſe the Apoſtle Paul ſtiles Barjeſus the Child of the Devil, on account of his being led or excited to commit thoſe ſins he accuſed him of, it may be replied that there is not any thing ſimilar with it contained in the Old Teſtament, and yet thoſe writings are the only authentic records from whence he could derive any knowledge of what he mentions as the effect of the power of the Devil on the heart or actions of men. But if we may conclude that by the words Thou Child of the Devil, the Apoſtle intended only to expreſs the enormity and complication of his crimes as a ſorcerer and a very wicked immoral man, it will remove all the difficulty by giving an eaſy and rational ſolution of them. In like manner as I have ſhewn in what the Apoſtle John hath ſaid of Cain, that he was of that wicked, or, as in the preceding verſe, a Child of the Devil.

and unbiaſſed reader, appear ſomewhat difficult to be accounted for, that of thoſe Jews only he has attributed their principle and conduct to the Devil; whereas, of all others, who were equally corrupt and unbelieving, he did not even once tell any of them they were his children, in the common acceptation of thoſe words, eſpecially when they gave him as great occaſion for expreſſing himſelf in as pointed a manner. To inſtance only thoſe Phariſees who wickedly and fooliſhly ſaid he caſt out devils, i. e. demons, by Belzebub the Prince of Devils, i. e. demons.

As it is manifeſt our Saviour has perſonified the wicked Jews who killed the prophets, as the cauſe of producing children like themſelves, i. e. the Jews he ſpake to, who, it is certain, had not the leaſt influence in effecting it; why ſhould it be judged incredible that he ſhould ſpeak after a like manner in his uſing the words Satan, &c. The Apoſtle, in the 6th chapter to the Romans, has perſonified ſin, as having been their lord and maſter, whom, before their converſion, they ſerved, in fulfilling the deſires of the fleſh and of the mind. But every intelligent perſon, without the leaſt objection, or difficulty, admits he is not to be underſtood in a literal ſenſe, but only as an expreſſive figure, in which, in ſtrong language, he deſcribes their former wicked principles and conduct, as he doth in the 1ſt chapter.

SECT.

SECT. III.

I have, in the foregoing pages, considered all the passages in the Evangelists, in which the wicked one, &c. is said to tempt men to sin; I will now attend to those in the Acts of the Apostles, and the other parts of the New Testament, of a similar kind.

AND the first that is related in the Acts, is chap. v. 3, 4, 9, concerning Ananias, to him Peter said, Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, to keep back part of the price of the land?—After telling him, in the next verse, it was in his own power or choice to sell the land or not; and after he had sold it, to keep the price of it, or put it into the joint stock, he charged him with conceiving what he had done, saying, Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, (in saying it was the whole given into the fund when it was but a part of it) but unto God. It may be said that Peter's words, v. 3, carry in them an affirmation that Ananias's heart was filled by Satan, as the moving or exciting cause of his committing that sin. Also that the Apostle really knew there was such a being, and that he temps men to sin. To which I reply, that the Apostle could not know either, from the Old Testament; and it is certain there is not any account in the Evangelists, that Jesus made any discovery of either to the Apostle, or other of them. And it is indisputably true, that he could not know either, by the light of his natural reason; besides, his attributing the sin to Satan, in the sense commonly understood, is not con-

 sistent

ſiſtent with what he ſaid to Ananias and his wiſe. To the former, Why haſt thou conceived this thing in thine heart; thou haſt not lied unto men, but unto God.—To the latter, How is it that we have agreed together to tempt the ſpirit of the Lord? In which he plainly attributes the primary moving cauſe to ariſe in their own breaſts, and in contriving how they might put it in practice.

Peter's words therefore may be thought to create ſome difficulty in determining whether he imputes Ananias's heart, being filled by Satan, or that the firſt riſe of it was in himſelf, in conceiving the thing: for, if Peter believed it was primarily owing to the former, it could not be to the latter but only in a ſecondary ſenſe; and had the Apoſtle known this to be the true ſtate of the caſe, one would naturally conclude he would in one or both the latter addreſſes to him, have in that manner repreſented it: but, it is certain, from his own words, he hath not. From the whole relation of this ſingular tranſaction, it appears to me, that the primary excitement in the heart of Ananias, to contrive and put in execution what is related of him, aroſe from his own coveteous mind, which ſuggeſted to him the thought of keeping back part of the price of the land, under the deluding hope, that could he ſucceed in concealing the tranſaction from the Apoſtle and others, he might receive from the joint ſtock a greater income than he had any right to; and alſo keep part of it for his own uſe; as may appear probable from chap. ii. 44, 45. iv. 32, 34, 35. and vi. 1, 2, 3. But their deceitful and criminal conduct was not only detected, but alſo puniſhed of God, in a very ſignal and exemplary manner, as a ſolemn and affecting warning to other diſciples, to avoid the like deceitful and wicked conduct.

That,

That, by the word Satan, Peter did not intend a fallen angel, is to me undeniable from what I have obſerved of the entire ſilence in the Old Teſtament, of ſuch a being, or his tempting men to ſin, by his infuſing evil thoughts into the mind; and that ſo far as we know, Jeſus did not inform his Apoſtles of it. It follows therefore, that Ananias could not underſtand or believe that by the word Satan Peter intended ſuch a being. Neither could Peter, ſo far as we know, have any real evidence on which to believe his heart was filled by him as the exciting cauſe of his doing what he did; or Ananias have any inward perception or conſciouſneſs of it. And, it hath been obſerved, that Peter imputes Ananias's ſin to his conceiving the thing in his heart, and that he and his wife had agreed together in that act.

When, in 2 Cor. xi. 14. the Apoſtle ſaith, Satan himſelf is *transformed* into an angel of light, I think he cannot well be underſtood to mean into one like an holy angel, it having no connection or coincidence with v. 13, 15. and therefore moſt probably he means an apoſtle of light, i. e. himſelf. See Gal. iv. 14. But then this transformation muſt be in a viſible character, as a teacher of his tenets, or doctrines, or an inviſible transformation. If we ſuppoſe the former to be his meaning it will be attended with very great, if not with inſuperable difficulties, to account for; there not being the leaſt hint, much leſs an inſtance of it related in the New Teſtament. If we ſuppoſe the Apoſtle means the latter, it will, I preſume, be attended with equal difficulties. For, it is natural to aſk, how, or by what means could his miniſters come at the knowledge of this, or receive their doctrine, or any explicit direction or authority, as from him, or act as his miniſters.

In the first Epistle chapter iv. 6. the same original word is translated I have—in a figure *transferred*—to myself, and Apollos—or rather to himself only; that is, I have contradistinguished, or contrasted myself and Apollos with the false apostles, for your sakes,, that as we always have acted as the stewards or servants of Christ only, and not made the least claim of headship over you, as though you were our disciples. (See chap. i. 12—15.) ye might learn, by our example, not to think of men, i. e. the false apostles, your leaders, above that which is written, and therefore not be puffed up for one against another. In this contrast of himself with the false apostles, he is not to be understood to admit their having the least claim to be the apostles of Christ any more than Satan, whom, he says, is transformed into an angel of light, i. e. an apostle of Christ.

To the foregoing considerations I may add, that when the Apostles in his 1 Epistle i. ii. contrasts the tenets or doctrines of the false apostles with the revelations of the spirit of God made to him, or the wisdom of God in the gospel, which he had taught the Corinthians; he calls their wisdom the wisdom of the wise, the wisdom of men, and the wisdom and spirit of men, and the wisdom and spirit of the world, or of the Princes of this world; but he hath not given the least hint that it was the wisdom or doctrine of Satan, which had he belived, it is natural to conclude he would have mentioned it, as a very strong argument why they ought to renounce it, and the false apostles as his ministers; but of these things he is entirely silent.

I will hazard a conjecture, and such I offer it, on v. 14, which, if admitted seems to obviate the difficulties above-mentioned, which is this, that one of the false apostles, on some account, perhaps as a

Jew,

Previous to the explaining xi. 13–16 I wa[...]
[t]hat the original word there rendered fals[...]
the same which in Matt XXIV. 11, 24 is tran[...]
[p]rophets & false Christs or v. 6 Many ~~[...]~~
[C]hrist will come in my name saying I am Chri[st]
[d]eceive many as the false ~~Christs~~ apostles [...]
[I]n like manner it is rendered in the text f[...]
[I]n 2 Pet. II. 1 it is rendered false teachers [...]
II. 14 Lye not — against the truth
In the first Epistle to the Corinthians ix
[h]ath stated that he & Barnabas as minist[ers]
[h]ad a just right to wages or maintenance
. 11, 12 & among other reasons why he had [...]
he said I have not used this power over [...]
[s]uffer all things lest I should hinder the gosp[el]
[...] be thought of by some to abuse my power
[...] In the chapter under consideration he [...]
[f]urther reasons It was not because he did not
[...] or otherwise but it was that he might cu[t]
[f]rom them (the false apostles) that desire occas[ion]
[...] itsel) that wherein they (that person) m[...]
[...]en or myself in not taking wages from [...]
[...]ed texts & those under consideration it [...]
[tha]t the transformation of the false apostle in[to]
[...] of Christ i.e. himself consisted in his no[...]
[wa]ges of his party or using that power ov[er]
[i]ngratiate himself into their esteem by [...]
[...]ble as disinterested as Paul But he did it

3—16 I would observe
ndered false apostles
. 11, 24 is translated false
Many ~~will~~ ~~say~~ saied
ng I am Christ & shall
~~ets~~ apostles among them
n the text false apostles
se teachers In James
eth

orinthians ix. the apostle
t as ministers of Christ
aen tenance from them
hy he had not taken &
power over you but I
nder the gospel of Christ
se my power in the gos
eration he assigns this
se he did not love them
he might cut off occasion
t desire occasion (to accuse
el person) may be found
wages From the fore
ration it planely appears
lse apostle into an apos
d in his not taking
t power over them was
er esteem by appearing
But he did it not lest it

should render the gospel of Christ as Paul did Whence with Paul the latter particularly was the true & real cause or reason why he did not And no marvel for Satan the adversary to me the false apostle is transformed into an angel of light ie my self Therefore it is no ~~marvel~~ great or strange thing if his ministers or agents who act in concert with him be also transformed into the ministers of righteousness whose end shall be according to their works That apostle of Christ — angel of light & minister of righteousness are by the apostle synonymous I think cannot be doubted by any one who pays a strict attention to the argument in the context & compares it with IX.

It should here be particularly noticed that one special part of his design in both chapters was to combat the pretentious & deceitful conduct of the false apostle by shewing the rest of the congregation that they ought not by any means to countenance him for as he tells them 1 Epis IV. 15 Tho you have ten thousand instructors in Christ yet have you not many fathers for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you by the gospel & not the false apostle who hath only built on the foundation I have laid wherefore I beseech you that ye be followers of me & not him In strict allusion to the false apostle the Satan or his adversary he said V. 6 These things (ie my apostolical character & ministry as opposed to him & his party) I have in a figure transferred ~~to my self & Apollos~~ (the same original word rendered transformed).

to my self & apollos (in the
of the false apostle) that ye
learn in us not to think
men (to him) above that
it is written that no one
you (the leader) be puffed
~~one~~ against another For
maketh thee to differ fr
~~one~~ another As to them se
apollos he assured them t
were ministers & stewards
& not leaders of partys
I cannot help thinking
upon a close attention
context it will clearly ap
that to suppose the apost
introduces a Satan a fall
angel an invisible spirit
his reasoning is intirely
ported & not in the least
cident with it For it wa
false apostle & his minist
adherents only that he
ferring & opposing to
apostolical order &
istry & not to a fallen
& his agents or ministers
indeed such a supposition
discountenanced by
farther consideration
neither the false apostle
any of the congregation

ender the gospel of Christ as Paul did Whereas with
latter particularly was the true & real cause or
why he did not And no marvel for Satan tho
to me the false apostle is transformed into an
of light ie my self Therefore it is no ~~marvel~~
strange thing if his ministers or agents who
concert with him be also transformed into the
s of righteousness whose end shall be according to
works That apostle of Christ angel of light &
of righteousness are by the apostle synnonemous
cannot be doubted by any one who pays a
attention to the argument in the context & com-
with ix.
should here be particularly noticed that one
part of his design in both chapters was to
the pretentions & deceitful conduct of the false
by shewing the rest of the congregation that
ought not by any means to counten ance him
tells them 1 Epis iv. 15 Tho you have ten
and instructors in Christ yet have you not
fathers for in Christ Jesus I have begotten
the gospel & not the false apostle who hath
on the foundation I have laid wherefore
you that ye be followers of me & not him In
allusion to the false apostle the Satan or his
he said iv. 6 These things (ie my apostolical
er & ministry as opposed to him & his party)
in a figure transferred ~~to my self & apollos~~
original word rendered transformed).

to my self & apollos (in the stead of the false apostle) that ye might learn in us not to think of men (to him) above that which it is written that no one of you (the leader) be puffed up for one against another For who maketh thee to differ from another as to him self & apollos he ap[p]lyed them they were ministers & stewards only & not leaders of partys

I cannot help thinking that upon a close attention to the context it will clearly appear that to suppose the apostles introduces a Satan a fallen angel an invisible spirit into his reasoning is intirely unsupported & not in the least consistent with it. For it was the false apostle & his ministers or adherents only that he is describing & opposing to his apostolical character & ministry & not to a fallen angel & his agents or ministers and indeed such a supposition is discountenanced by this farther consideration viz that neither the false apostle nor any of the congregation

could understand whom he
meant because there is no
mention of such an apostate
Spirit in the old Testament &
it is certain they had not any
other authentic means of
information of it I may just
ask by what rule the people
could know that an invisible
Spirit was transformed into
an angel of light ie Paul &
act as such among them But
of the false apostles there was
not the least difficulty

The foregoing MS. is the Author's own autograph addition to page 37; as I was informed by W. Kite, when I bought this of him in 1842.

[illegible]

Jew, chap i. 23. 2 Epiſtle xi. 22, 23, was head or chief among them, and on that account put himſelf upon an equality, in his apoſtolic character, with Paul, and that the others acted at leaſt in a meaſure, if not wholly by his inſtruction and authority, and with him were deceitful workers transforming themſelves into the apoſtles and miniſters of Chriſt.

The Apoſtles ſtiling him Satan, or an adverſary, i. e. to him and his doctrine, is not much unlike what Jeſus ſaid of Peter, that he was Satan and of Judas, that he is a devil.

When the Apoſtle, addreſſing himſelf to the Epheſians, Acts xx. 29. 30, ſaith, that after his departure, ſhall grievous wolves enter in among you, not ſparing the flock, alſo of your own ſelves, ſhall men ariſe, ſpeaking perverſe things to draw away diſciples after them, as was the conduct of thoſe falſe apoſtles at Corinth, he doth not give them the leaſt hint that any of them would be the miniſters of Satan. And when our Saviour foretold that falſe teachers, or prophets, would ariſe and deceive many by their doctrine, he did not give the leaſt intimation of their being the agents of Satan, or that they would receive his tenets, or act by his authority.

The Apoſtle ſaith to the Epheſians, chap. ii. 2. That in times paſt ye walked according to the courſe of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the ſpirit that now worketh in the children of diſobedience, among whom alſo we all had our converſation in times paſt in the luſts of the fleſh and of the mind.

Wheover reads Romans i, ii, iii, will plainly obſerve the Apoſtle hath given a particular and large repreſentation of the principles and conduct of the Heathens, and in general from whence they aroſe; but

but it is certain he hath not attributed either to the temptations of Satan, but to the course of this world, or the examples of those they lived amongst, and from whom they learned them, by which they fulfilled the desires of the mind, &c.

And the Apostle's representation of the principles and conduct of the Roman Christians before their conversion, as chap. vi. perfectly corresponds with the above chapters. See also Ephes. iv. 17—22. Col. iii. 5—9. May we not therefore, with great probability, at least, if not with an absolute certainty, conclude, that by the Prince of the power of the air, the spirit that worked in the children of disobedience, the Apostle did not mean a fallen angel, but their own corrupt and wicked desires and principles; besides, it should be remembered it hath been shewed that there is not any account in the Old Testament, of a fallen angel, and therefore that neither Paul nor those Christians could know there was such a being, and that he tempted them to fulfil the desires of the mind, &c.

Another text I will offer to the reader's consideration is Ephes. vi. 11, Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the Devil.

Whoever believes that these Christians understood the Apostle, by the word Devil, to mean a fallen angel, and that they ought to stand against his wiles, lest they should fail in acting agreeable to their Christian profession,—it will be natural to ask him from what unquestionable records or proofs they received the knowledge of each? That they did not, nor could receive it from the Old Testament, hath been made evident in the preceding pages. Also there is not the least trace in the Evangelists that Jesus revealed either to his disciples; and it is a certain truth that they could not know

know them from the light of nature, consequently they could not understand the Apostle in the sense generally embraced by men at this day. But if by the word Devil, the Apostle meant an adversary they were well acquainted with, it must mean men only who were their adversaries; and this appears to me evident from the next verse and verse 16. Compare Matt. x. 18. Mark xiii. 9, 12, 13, which perfectly accord with every expression of Jesus, in which he foretold to his disciples who would be their adversaries. See 1 Thess. iii. 3, 4, 5. And whoever reads Luke's History of the Acts, and Paul's writings, will plainly discern that it was such the Christians are exhorted to stand against their wiles.

Besides, I may add, if they stood against, or resisted the wiles of an invisible spirit, which affected their minds as a temptation, they must not only evidently perceive its operation and influence on their mind, but also distinguish those wiles from other excitements of temptation, arising either within themselves or from the impression of external causes. But I am fully convinced that there are no proofs or facts in Scripture to evince that they or any others did make such a distinction between them; and yet if they did not, I leave it to the consideration of the impartial enquirer to explain clearly the means by which they could really know what were his wiles, and also when they stood against or resisted them. It is upon their being able to make this distinction that they could discern and form a true judgment of the propriety and applicableness of the Apostle's exhortation to them.

The foregoing observations, I apprehend, may tend to explain our Lord's words to Paul, Acts xxvi. 18. that he sent him to the Gentiles to turn

them from darkneſs to light, and from the power of Satan, unto God. See v. 20. I ſhould think it can hardly be doubted, that by the Gentiles being in darkneſs, and in the power of Satan, are deſigned to expreſs the ſame thing, and not that the former was the effect of the power of the latter. After a like manner I preſume we are to underſtand the words turned to light, or unto God, are expreſſive of the ſame ſtate, i. e. their converſion to the goſpel. Epheſ. iv. 20—24. Now, what the ſtate of darkneſs is, or the ſins intended, we learn from Rom. xiii. 12, 13, 14. The Apoſtle, writing to the Gentile Coloſſians, uſeth expreſſions perfectly equivalent with thoſe we are conſidering, i. 13. Who hath delivered us from the power of darkneſs, and hath tranſlated us into the kingdom of his dear Son. What he intends by their having been in the power of darkneſs, i. e. their former ſins, is plain from iii. 1—8. and Epheſ. iv. 17—19. v. 8, 11, 12.

Another text, ſomewhat ſimilar with that in Epheſians ii. 2. already conſidered, is what the Apoſtle ſaith, 2 Cor. iv. 4. In whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, leſt the light of the glorious goſpel of Chriſt, who is the image of God, ſhould ſhine unto them.* By comparing theſe words with chapter the

* Sir Edward Knatchbull in his Annotations, renders the words under conſideration thus:—" If our goſpel be hid, it is hid among thoſe that are loſt; among whom God hath blinded the minds of the unbelievers of this age, leſt the light of the glorious goſpel of Chriſt ſhould ſhine unto them (that is ſo ſhine) as that they ſhould ſee and underſtand." See Rom. xi. 3, &c. 2 Theſ. ii. 10, 11, 12.

If the Apoſtle alluded to Iſaiah vi. 8, &c. it is plain that their hearing and not underſtanding, &c. is repreſented as

the 3d, and particularly with verses 13, 14, 15, it appears very plain to me, that he spake of the unbelieving Jews respecting their blindness of mind, i. e. they did not see the true design and end of the law as centering in Christ, no more than the Israelites saw the face of Moses when he covered it with a veil. That by the God of this world, the Apostle did intend Satan, and that he was the real cause of the blindness of mind of the Jews, is plain to me from his own account of it in these texts. Rom. ix. 31, 32, 33. x. 1—4. xi. 7—32. 1 Cor. i. 22, 23. See also 1 Pet. ii. 7, 8, John ix. 39, 40, 41. Matt. xiii. 13, 14, 15. And the Apostle himself was a remarkable instance of that blindness of mind, or his ignorance in unbelief, which he imputed to the Jews. But, I judge, it will appear evident to every one who is conversant in his writings, that he hath not even once attributed it to Satan as the god of this world, but to other causes, as manifest facts, from whence it arose. 1 Tim. i. 13. Neither hath Jesus, nor the Evangelists, in any one text, ascribed the blindness of mind of the Jews, to the God of this world, i. e. to Satan; but to very different ones that are plainly related in their writings, and therefore are easily discerned and admitted by every impartial reader.

as from God, who sent him to deliver that message to them. For though it is said in John xii 39, 40, Therefore they (that is the Jews, to whom Jesus addressed himself) could not believe, because that Esaias said again, &c. Yet I presume it cannot reasonably be believed that the prophet of himself was able to effect what is mentioned.

The true reason or cause of their hearing and not understanding, &c. was their wicked principles and conduct, as appears plain from Isaiah chap. i. Jer. v. 21. Ezek. xii. 2. And in a like sense is Paul to be understood, Acts xxviii. 24—27.

The Apoſtle Peter, in his 1ſt epiſtle, v. 8, 9, 10, ſaith, Be ſober, be vigilant, becauſe your adverſary the Devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about ſeeking whom he may devour, whom reſiſt ſtedfaſt in the faith, knowing that the ſame afflictions are accompliſhed in your brethren that are in the world. But the God of all grace, who hath called us to his eternal kingdom, by Jeſus Chriſt, after that ye have ſuffered a while, (i. e. under thoſe afflictions) make you perfect, eſtabliſh, ſtrengthen, ſettle you.

This repreſentation of the Devil, or adverſary (they are exhorted to reſiſt) in his eagerneſs after, and devouring his prey, or whom he may, is manifeſtly taken from the lion's ravenous fierceneſs after his prey; and when he has ſeized it, his devouring it. And whoever reads the following texts, beſides many more, will plainly diſcern it fully exemplified in the perſecutors of the diſciples of Jeſus, eſpecially by the unbelieving Jews, in their ravenous ſpirit and conduct towards them. Acts viii. 13, 21. Gal. i. 13. Acts xiii. 44, 45, 50. xvi. 5, 6, 7, 13. xxi. 27—31. xxii. 21, 22, 23. xxiii. 12, &c. 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25. But the Apoſtle's repreſentation does not equally, if at all, apply to the conduct of the Devil, who, by moſt men, is ſuppoſed to attack men by his ſecret or imperceptible devices, or inſtigations on their mind or heart. Even his tempting Jeſus, as it is related, doth not accord with Peter's repreſentation.

I think it is natural to ſuppoſe, that the afflictions which theſe Chriſtians endured, and were accompliſhed, alſo in their brethren that were in the world, from the ſame kind of adverſary, are the perſecutions the Apoſtle mentions more at large, chap. iii. 12—19. If this is admitted, as moſt probable, we cannot well fail in underſtanding him

him to mean the adverſary that perſecuted them. Perhaps to this will be objected his exhorting them to reſiſt the adverſary as though he intended a perſonal reſiſtance. But to this it may be replied, in his own words; it was by being ſtedfaſt in the faith, i. e. by an inflexible adherence to their profeſſion as Chriſtians. There are two texts in which the ſame original word occurs, that may ſerve to illuſtrate and confirm this to be his meaning. Our Saviour told his Apoſtles, Luke xxi. 15, I will give you a mouth and wiſdom, which all your adverſaries ſhall not be able to reſiſt. This was exemplified in Stephen, Acts vi. 9. 10. The unbelieving Jews were not able *to reſiſt* the wiſdom and the ſpirit by which he ſpake to them. In this caſe there was reſiſting on both ſides; on his it was by the wiſdom and the ſpirit.

To thoſe Peter wrote to there was no difficulty in their knowing what were their own afflictions and thoſe of their brethren that were in the world, but there ſeems to me a very conſiderable one attending their knowing what they were, if underſtood, of the wiles or devices of an inviſible ſpirit on their hearts or minds.

Should it be ſaid that the Devil ſtirred up or excited their enemies to perſecute them, and in that ſenſe he exhorted them to reſiſt him; I anſwer, that in the many texts in the Evangeliſts in which Jeſus declared to his apoſtles and diſciples what it was that would ſtir up their enemies to perſecute them, he has not even once attributed it to the Devil. Neither hath Luke, in his Hiſtory of the Apoſtles, in deſcribing the perſecutions they met with, even in one text, attributed it to him. Inſtead of this, Jeſus and that hiſtorian have aſcribed it to other and very different cauſes that are therein plainly related, and very much becauſe they were

his

his diſciples; or, as he ſaid, If they perſecute me, they will alſo perſecute you.

There is one text in the 1 Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, that, I judge, will illuſtrate and confirm the foregoing explication of that under conſideration, chap. ii. 18. Wherefore we would have come unto you (even I, Paul) once and again, but *Satan hindered us.* In looking into Acts xvii. it appears, that after he had converted many of the Theſſalonians to the faith of Chriſt, or that they had obeyed the goſpel he preached to them, the unbelieving Jews ſeeing his ſucceſs, ſtirred up the baſer ſort of the people, and raiſed ſo great a perſecution againſt him, and the new converts, that the brethren judged it expedient to ſend away Paul by night, in a ſecret manner, who went to Berea, where, for ſome time, he preached the goſpel, and converted many of them. Upon thoſe Jews at Theſſalonica, hearing of this, they came there alſo, and acted after a like manner; upon which account the brethren ſent Paul away to Athens, ſome of whom accompanied him, but Timothy and Silas continued behind. In this ſtate of things the Apoſtle left his new converts at Theſſalonica, at which his mind was ſo uneaſy, that when Timothy came to him at Athens, he ſent him back to them, that he might comfort and eſtabliſh them in their faith under their perſecutions; who, on his return to Corinth, Acts xviii. 5. brought him a moſt agreeable account of their ſtedfaſtneſs in the faith. On a view of this ſtate of things, there ſeems to be great difficulty in judging who the Satan, or adverſary is, that hindered him from returning to them, as he had more than once wiſhed to do, namely, the perſecuting Jews.

That which adds ſome force to this explication, is, what he ſays, chap. iii. 4, 5, 6. For, verily, when

when we were with you we told you before, that we should suffer tribulation, even as it came to pass, and ye know, for this cause, when I could no longer forbear, I sent to know your faith, lest, by some means, the tempter having tempted you, and our labour be in vain, &c. The tempter likely to tempt them, appears evident from the context, i. e. the persecuting Jews, by whom they suffered tribulation, as well as himself.

The Apostle James, in chap. iv. 7. saith, resist the Devil, and he will flee from you. In verses 5, 6, he tells them, The spirit, or temper that dwells in some of them, lusteth to envy. But to those who endeavoured to govern it, he assures them for their encouragement, that God giveth more grace, but he resisteth the proud and envious, but giveth grace unto the humble. And then he very justly exhorts them to submit themselves to God, i. e. to his grace; resist the Devil and he will flee from you. Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you. If, by their resisting the Devil, the Apostle means the spirit of pride and envy excited or stirred up in them by him; or that by his secret influence he strengthened it, than for the persons to judge of the propriety and justness of his exhortation, they must have clear evidence by which they could know it was really produced or wrought in them by the Devil, unless the Apostle and the persons believed it never existed in the minds of men, but from that cause alone; which, I presume, no one will attempt to prove, much less effect it. For if it is allowed, as surely it will, that the spirit of pride may be, and is often produced in the mind of man, from very different causes, both internal as well as external. If this is allowed, then the person in whom it dwells, must, as was observed, have a real inward perception, or evidence,

evidence, by which he can and actually did distinguish its arising from the excitation or influence of the Devil, and not from other and very different causes, otherwise he would not have been able to know, with any real certainty, it arose from him. For if he is incapable of making that distinction, he certainly cannot know whether he resists the Devil, or any internal or outward well known cause, or causes, from whence that spirit lusting in him, may be, or is produced; and when not resisted, shews itself in envy to others.

And, I persuade myself, there is not now any rational man who believes that Satan does tempt men to be proud, or envious, that can make that distinction, or discrimination between that which is excited in him by Satan, and what arises from his natural passion not duly governed, and from whence he is drawn into sin. This pride and envy the Apostle speaks of, seems, from the context, to be the adversary they were to resist, and concerning which they were competent judges; but, I apprehend, they were not, as it respected an invisible spirit. Indeed, did it appear that the sacred writers have always, or very generally attributed pride, or the usual effect of it, envy, to the secret instigation of the Devil, as a fallen angel, there would be some reason to believe that the Apostle intended him in the text under consideration; but, I presume, it will not be found thus represented in any of those writings.

Similar with the Apostle's words, are those of Paul, Ephes. iv. 29, 27, Be ye angry and sin not; let not the sun go down upon your wrath, neither give place to the Devil. The above observation, I judge, will apply equally to these words, because no one can really distinguish between anger and its effects, as arising from any external cause, affecting that

that passion, and what may be effected in him by the influence of an invisible spirit.

In chap. i. 14, 15, the Apostle hath given a very plain account of what are the inward natural causes in every man, of his being tempted, i. e. when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin. This is so entirely correspondent to the natural and universal experience of every man, that I should judge it will be admitted is not only justly founded, but so far as men really know what passes within themselves, is the original, inward, and true cause of their being tempted to sin.

No 7 No 13. See Joshua VII. 19, 20. 21.

The Apostle John, in his 1 Epistle iii. 8. 10, saith, He that committeth sin is of the Devil, for the Devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the Devil. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the Devil. Whoever doth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother. Understanding these words literally and without limitation, and comparing them with chap. v. 18, 19, some may be ready to suppose he believed and has asserted, that every wicked action men commit, originates from the influence or devices of the Devil in their heart, and that Jesus was sent to destroy his power in them, or his work manifest in their conduct.

The Apostle saith of Cain, verse 12, he was of that wicked one, or one of the children of the Devil; as v. 10. who slew his brother, or did not love him, and wherefore slew he him, because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous. These words may assist us in explaining those under consideration, and the last cited text; for he himself has here assigned the real and true cause

 from

from whence Cain was excited to commit that wicked action. And this perfectly agrees with what is related in Gen. iv. 4, &c. where it is ſaid, The Lord had reſpect unto Abel, and to his offering; but unto Cain and his offering he had not reſpect, and Cain was very wrath, and his countenance fell. To whom the Lord ſaid, Why art thou wrath, and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doſt well ſhalt thou not be accepted; and if thou doſt not well, ſin lieth at the door. Under this ſtate of Cain's mind, and his ſuffering his wrath to overcome his reaſon, and his not being influenced by what the Lord ſaid to him, it is manifeſt he was excited to kill his brother; or, in the words of the Apoſtle James, juſt cited, He was tempted being drawn away by his own luſt, and enticed; and when luſt had conceived, it brought forth ſin. In the above chapter it is indiſputable that there is not the leaſt intimation of Cain's being tempted to that action by the inſtigation of the Devil, as a fallen angel, as was noted. The Apoſtle hath aſſigned the true cauſe of his ſlaying his brother, which coincides with what is related in Geneſis. Seeing then he ſpeaks of Cain as of that wicked one, or one of the children of the Devil, though it doth in the laſt appear from Geneſis, nor his own words, that he was excited to it by him, but by his own wrath againſt his brother. Why ſhould it be believed he attributes his ſin, or that of all other men, to the wicked one, or the Devil. By either of thoſe words one would therefore rather be led to belive the Apoſtle intends an adverſary like as was that to Cain, i. e. mens unſubdued paſſions, or deſires; and on that account he calls them the children of the Devil, or of the wicked one; and from mens having been influenced thereby, the world laid in wickedneſs, correſpondent

to

to which the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the Gentile world, Epheſ. v. 6. Col. iii. 6. That they were the childred of diſobedience. Or to the Theſſalonians, they were children of the night, and of darkneſs; or, in our Lord's words to the unbelieving Jews, That they were the children of thoſe men who in ages paſt killed the prophets. Compare what hath been obſerved with Rom. vi. in which chapter the Apoſtle attributes the wickedneſs of the Heathen world to a like adverſary that led Cain to ſlay his brother, i. e. they yielded their members or paſſions as inſtruments of unrighteouſneſs unto ſin; or by obeying the luſts of their mortal body, ſin reigned in and over them. To reform men from their ſins which aroſe from thoſe cauſes, as their adverſary was one of the primary ends and purpoſes for which the Son of God was manifeſted that he might deſtroy thoſe works; or, in the words of the Apoſtle John, the works of the Devil.

That which will much illuſtrate what I have obſerved, are the exhortations of the Apoſtle Paul to thoſe in whom Chriſt, by his miniſters, had deſtroyed their wicked works. And the whole of it is comprehended in the laſt cited chapter. To whom he ſaith, Let not ſin reign in your mortal body, that ye ſhould obey it in the luſts thereof, &c. and add, Epheſ. v. 25, 26, 27. iv. 17—29. v. 3, &c. Col. iii. 5—10.

In further ſupport and illuſtration of the foregoing ſcripture proofs and obſervations, ſhewing it is at leaſt highly probable, if not abſolutely certain, that the paſſages I have quoted, are not to be underſtood, in the common acceptation, of the real exiſtence of a fallen angel, and that he tempts men to ſin, I will offer what the Apoſtle ſaith, Gal. iv. 17. Rom. vii. 21, 22, 23, compared with vi.

 11—20.

11—20. In chap. vii. he clearly deſcribes the Jews as ſinners under the law, wherein it is exceeding evident to me, he repreſents the inward man as conſiſting of two parts; one is, his reaſon and conſcience; the other, his ſeveral paſſions and appetites. The former are appointed by the Author of his being, to rule or govern the latter; and when they are not under its direction and control, they move and excite him to ſinful actions, in oppoſition to his reaſon and conſcience. And he as plainly deſcribes the inward ſtruggle, or conflict between them; one as the law of his mind, and the other the law of his members; and that when the latter prevails over the former, he is brought into captivity to ſin; or, in his own words, I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is preſent with me; or, I ſee a law in my members warring againſt the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of ſin, which is in my members; or, as he expreſſes it in other words in the Galatians, The fleſh luſteth againſt the ſpirit, and the ſpirit againſt the fleſh; and theſe are contrary the one to the other, ſo that ye do not the things that ye would. The luſts of the fleſh are particularly mentioned, Rom. i, 19, &c. Gal. v. 19, 20, 21.

I cannot avoid particularly obſerving, that in the fore-cited chapters the Apoſtle hath not even hinted that the members of the man who is captivated by ſin, is excited or ſtirred up, or brought into that ſtate by Satan, but entirely by his own ungoverned luſts, or inordinate deſires warring againſt the law of his mind. And yet, I ſhould think, it will be allowed to be natural to expect he would have mentioned this with the other cauſes of it, eſpecially conſidering what he has particularly ſaid upon that ſubject, had he been of the ſame opinion with

moſt

moſt men at this day, who attribute almoſt, if not all the ſins which men commit, to the devices of Satan.

I ſhall here ſubjoin Mr. Farmer's explication of ſome texts where the words Devil and Satan occur, and I will here produce ſeveral paſſages from the New Teſtament:—Have not I (ſaith Chriſt) choſen you twelve, and one of you is a Devil?—He here refers to the traitor, who was not the chief of fallen angels, but one who acted the part of an enemy in betraying his maſter. Neither give place to the Devil; that is, give no occaſion to the railer or ſlanderer to reproach your religion; which is the ſenſe given of this paſſage by Eraſmus and others. A Biſhop muſt not be a novice, or a new convert, leſt, being lifted up with pride, he falls into the condemnation of the Devil, or calumniator. Moreover he muſt have a good report of them that are without, leſt he ſhould fall into reproach, and the ſnare of the Devil, or the adverſary and the ſlanderer. It is hard to ſay what peculiar advantage the Devil might derive from a Biſhop's want of a good report of them that are without; but it is eaſy to ſee that this would expoſe him to the cenſure and to the ſtratagems of the enemies of religion, who might try to ſhame him out of thoſe principles, which ſerved only to reproach and condemn him. The term Devil, is uſed in the plural number, in the New Teſtament, juſt as Satan is in the Old; when it cannot refer to fallen angels. St. Paul, in two of his epiſtles, forbids women to be Devils, rendered ſlanderers, and falſe accuſers. 1 Tim. iii. 11. Titus ii. 3. In this ſenſe it is uſed of men, 2 Tim, iii. 3, and rendered falſe accuſers.

In the 1 Epiſtle to the Corinthians, chap. v. 5, are theſe words reſpecting the inceſtuous member of

of that congregation:—To deliver ſuch an one unto Satan for the deſtruction of the fleſh, that the ſpirit may be ſaved in the day of the Lord Jeſus,

To an attentive and unbiaſſed man who reads theſe words and the context, I believe he will find it extremely difficult to form a juſt conception in what ſenſe the perſon was to be delivered unto, or put in the power of Satan, if underſtood to be an inviſible ſpirit, eſpecially to anſwer the end there mentioned; for it cannot conſiſtent with reaſon be ſuppoſed, much leſs believed, that a malevolent ſpirit, being the avowed enemy of man, as is generally believed he is, would exert his power over him, to effect that ſalutary end; but on the contrary, try his utmoſt to continue his impenitence perpetual, that he might not be ſaved. If we may be permitted to ſuppoſe, that by his being delivered unto Satan, means not only his being ſeparated from the congregation, equally as he was before his converſion; but alſo excluded from the benefits he enjoyed as a member of Chriſt's body; and that this would have a very probable tendency to bring him to a true ſenſe of his crime, that he might be ſaved. It will, I preſume, be the moſt natural and rational explication of the Apoſtle's general meaning, and which ſeems to be confirmed from the effect it produced, as mentioned by him, 2 Epheſ, ii. 5, &c. vii. 12.

Somewhat ſimilar to the inceſtuous Corinthian being delivered unto Satan, &c. is what the Apoſtle mentions, 1 Tim. iii. 20, of his conduct towards Hymencus and Alexander, whom he had delivered unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaſpheme. But can any rational man really believe, that if they had been delivered into the power of a malignant ſpirit, the ſuppoſed enemy of man, that he would have exerted it to reform them from their

wicked

wicked conduct, that they might not in future blaspheme, but act consistent with their Christian character ?—I presume he cannot believe this of him, but, on the contrary, that he would have exerted his influence over them to continue it. Whatever therefore the Apostle meant by the word Satan, he cannot in reason be understood to intend a malignant apostate angelic spirit.

Should any one suppose that by delivering either of the persons unto Satan, the Apostle intends his inflicting on them some bodily or mental disorder, by which means the former might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus, and the latter persons learn thereby not to blaspheme; it may be justly replied, that such a supposition hath not the least countenance or support from any thing of the kind in all the Bible, and therefore is inadmissible in explaining the genuine meaning of the Apostle. Should it be urged that the bodily and mental disorders which the Demoniacs were afflicted with, related in the Evangelists, were inflicted by the Devil, as a fallen angel, it may be justly replied, that they are not attributed to such a being, but to a demon or demons, i. e. the soul or spirit of man departed. For in every instance which in our translation the word Devil or Devils, is rendered Diamonion and not Diabolos.

In reference to this very case of the offender, the Apostle saith to his brethren, chap. ii. 10, 11, that he forgave him upon his repentance in the person, or by the authority of Christ, and that the brethren ought to do the like, for which he assigns this reason, viz. Lest Satan get an advantage of us, for we are not ignorant of his devices. If the Apostle and his brethren were not ignorant, but really knew what they were; or as the original word is rendered the mind, as chap. iii. 24. iv. 4.

iv. 4. xi. 3. of Satan; it is certain they were better qualified to prevent his getting an advantage of them, than all other men who have not that knowledge of his devices; but if they really had that knowledge of them, it is natural to aſk from whence or by what means they obtained it, for it is certain that they could not, from any part of the Old Teſtament writings, know not that there is ſuch a being as a fallen angel, as I have made appear.

By Satan, or the enemy, I think it probable the Apoſtle means the enemies of the Chriſtian religion, who might take advantage by refuſing to receive the penitent offender again into their fellowſhip, by repreſenting them as rigorouſly inflexible in their conduct towards them.

Should it be objected that the Apoſtle uſeth the word Satan in the ſingular, and therefore that my explication of many enemies doth not accord therewith; I anſwer, ſo he does of the word Satan and Tempter, in 1 Theſſ. ii. 18. iii. 5. But I have ſhewed it to be at leaſt very probable that he means the Jews who were his and their enemies.

Since the publication of this Tract, it hath been objected that the opinion therein maintained is injurious to practical religion, by inducing men to believe that they have no other enemy to encounter with, but what ariſes from themſelves and the ſnares of the world;—I know of no better anſwer to it, than the Apoſtle James hath given, in the words already cited. That every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own luſt and enticed, &c. See Matt. xiii. 21, 22, 23. Mark iv. 17, 18, 19. And this is unqueſtionably confirmed from the experience of every ſinner, at this time, and in all paſt ages, and alſo from the teſtimony of all hiſtory, both ſacred and prophane.

CONCLU-

CONCLUSION.

IF the explanation of the paſſages quoted in the preceding pages, are juſtly founded and admitted, it will have an immediate and happy tendency to relieve the minds of thoſe who believe, that at certain times they are conflicting with the ſecret and evil ſuggeſtions of Satan, and the influence they judge they have upon their heart, as what occaſions much diſquietude and perplexity, and interrupts their peace; and in ſome perſons this is very conſiderable.

To thoſe who may ſee juſt reaſon to be of the ſame opinion with the writer, will plainly ſee, that much of the ſubject of ſermonizing is not founded in ſcripture, but ariſes from miſtaking, or not clearly underſtanding the genuine meaning of thoſe writers on the ſubject here diſcuſſed. To ſhew men in the cleareſt manner by what means, or from what real and apparent cauſes they are liable to, or are tempted to ſin, which they themſelves are capable of perceiving with certainty, from what paſſes within them, or their own inward feeling or experience; or that every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own luſt and enticed; and that luſt when it hath conceived, bringeth forth ſin, will certainly have a plain and direct tendency to warn them againſt it; and if thereby they are drawn into ſin, by what means they may deliver themſelves out of it, i. e. by over-ruling or ſubduing their luſts, or evil deſires for the future. But to exhort men to reſiſt a tempter, whoſe ſuggeſtions or devices on

their hearts, they are not able to diſtinguiſh from their own evil luſts or deſires, muſt, I preſume, appear to every rational man, but of little practical uſe; whereas that which was juſt mentioned they perfectly well know, becauſe it is grounded upon almoſt every day's experience in themſelves and in others.

In the foregoing pages I have offered to the reader's conſideration every material paſſage in the New Teſtament, where in general or particular is related the devices or temptations of the Devil, &c. with my obſervations and explications of them. As I am convinced, they run counter to the very general and long eſtabliſhed opinion which men of every denomination have of Satan, &c. and of his tempting men to ſin, I muſt beg a truce with ſuch perſons, requeſting that with as little bias and prejudice as they are capable of, they will examine the ſeveral texts I have offered, and the contexts, and weigh the evidence on which they have been explained, as what appears to me to be their genuine import; and I would hope that the ſenſible and diſcerning part of my readers will not ſuffer themſelves to be influenced and governed in their judgment by the antiquity of their opinion, or, becauſe it has been ſanctioned by many men of diſtinguiſhed learning and abilities, who, in their annotations on thoſe paſſages, have given a very different ſenſe of them than I have offered.*

* The veneration that men have for writings of great name and eminent piety, incline them to admit all their opinions at once, without examination; on the other hand they reject, without heſitation, the doctrines propoſed to them by thoſe who are cenſured as impious and prophane; Fearing to partake of other mens guilt, they dread conviction as a crime. FARMER.

There

There is one opinion reſpecting Satan, or the Devil, that in this enlightened age is very much, if not entirely relinquiſhed, which, for many ages paſt was univerſally, or at leaſt very generally believed to be founded upon the teſtimony of ſcripture; and that is his bewitching men, by having poſſeſſion in them, or, at leaſt, by his ſecret influence on their mind. And were men as calmly and with a like unprejudiced mind, to attend to the texts already cited, and the explication given of them, it is probable they will ſee juſt reaſon to alter their opinion of his tempting men to ſin; as what appears to me is alike unfounded in thoſe writings. At leaſt, in reading theſe pages, it is poſſible they may diſcern clearer and ſtronger proofs on the oppoſite ſides of the queſtion, than they apprehend could be offered in favor of it.

Should the foregoing explication of the paſſages which repreſent Satan as a tempter of men to ſin, appear to be the true meaning of them, I preſume it will tend to remove an objection which ſome perſons may make againſt Revelation, or thoſe parts of it. For, I ſhould judge, it will be allowed, at leaſt, by many perſons, that excluſive of ſuch a tempter, or that men derive any moral corruption from the ſin of their firſt parents, they are of themſelves too much inclined or prone to tranſgreſs the law of their nature and the precepts of Revelation. For to ſuppoſe that they are under the power or influence of thoſe two additonal excitements to it, muſt lay ſuch a ſtrong bias upon their rational powers, or the law of the mind, in their chooſing or willing what is right and their duty to perform, as cannot but place them in a ſtate exceedingly diſadvantageous to their moral and religious improvement, eſpecially thoſe of them who have not the

advantage of knowing the precepts and motives contained in Revelation; and which, if admitted, may be found not reconcileable with the goodneſs of God, their Creator.*

That man is liable to be tempted to ſin by his own paſſions, or inordinate deſires, when they are not properly governed, excluſive of any moral taint or corruption, he is by many ſuppoſed to derive from the ſin of his firſt parents, is undeniable from their firſt tranſgreſſion; who, it is certain, were not from thence in the leaſt excited or influenced to tranſgreſs againſt the poſitive law of God given them.

If the explication I have given of the texts cited in the preceding pages, be juſtly founded, it is poſſible the following objection may be made to it, which is, How, or by what means are we to account for what Jeſus, the Evangeliſt, and the Apoſtles have ſaid of Satan or the Devil, as a being then exiſting, if there really be no ſuch being? For, it will be urged, that what they have ſaid of his acts, implies it; and alſo their exhortations to reſiſt his devices and temptations.—To which I anſwer, if there be any force in the objection, it equally applies to what they have ſaid of *Demons*, which, in a like manner ſuppoſes not only their exiſtence, but alſo their having power to poſſeſs the bodies of men, and produce diſorders in them, ſuch as are related in the New Teſtament; and

* I ſubmit it to the deliberate judgment of the intelligent and enlightened reader, whether the belief of Satan's being the principal if not the ſole cauſe of mens ſinning, and conſequently of the effects reſulting from it are not too coincident with and patronizes the Manichian opinion of an evil principle to be admitted by thoſe who profeſs the Chriſtian religion, which plainly teaches them that God alone rules and governs over all his mortal creatures.

yet,

yet, notwithstanding this, I presume it is a truth not to be disproved or justly controverted, that neither the Evangelists, nor the Apostles had, or could have received any real knowledge of either of those things; and for these unanswerable reasons, viz. Because there is not any revelation made of them in the Old Testament; and it is impossible by the light of their natural reason, or understanding, they could derive any knowledge of them, any more than it respects Satan, and for the same reasons.

And there is not the least account in the New Testament that Jesus revealed those things to the Apostles or Evangelists.

To me it appears, that the only obvious method of answering the objection, or accounting for what those persons have mentioned of demons is, by admitting the disorders or infirmities of mens bodies to be natural indispositions, and not the effects of a possessing demon, or an *human departed spirit*. So likewise what they have said of Satan and his acts, may, on a like ground, be considered as the lusts or evil desires of men, excited in them from various causes, by which, as the Apostle James saith, every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed; and when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin.

I readily own, that were there any clear revelation, in the Old Testament, of a fallen angel, and that he tempted men to sin, it would certainly be very natural to understand the several texts I have cited, in the common acceptation of them; but, as I have just observed, there is not in those writings any mention of either of those particulars.

If the foregoing proofs, from Scripture, and the observations founded thereon, are admitted, as entirely invalidating the common opinion concerning the

the Devil, or Satan, and his tempting men to ſin, it eventually and decidedly proves that the Heathen oracles and the Prieſts and Prieſteſſes being inſpired by ſuch a being, is entirely groundleſs, there being not the leaſt proof of their reality; but they wholly originated from, and were ſupported by the cunning and artful. Whether the learned or unlearned, or both, who were concerned therein, and who, therefore, whether from ſiniſter or political ends, or both, impoſed on the weakneſs and credulity of the people.

And theſe obſervations, and the concluſion juſt mentioned, are equally true, as it reſpects demons, i. e. the ſouls of men departed, whether of heroes or others.

POSTSCRIPT.

If the foregoing proofs, from Scripture, and the reaſoning deduced from them, that there is not any real evidence of there being any fallen angel, or angels; and that they tempt men to ſin, is juſtly founded, it will eventually and decidedly prove, that no man in any paſt age of the world, hath been poſſeſſed by one of them; and, conſequently, that any bodily or mental diſorders, or both, that have, by Dr. Worthington and others, been aſcribed to their power in, or over men, is wholly void of any evident or real proof from Scripture; and conſequently, that the teſtimony of the Fathers in the primitive ages, or by any other writers in more modern ones, have not any real foundation in truth, notwithſtanding the very circumſtantial relations they gave of them, and conſequently, that the many accounts which thoſe writers give of the manner or the means by which they have aſſerted that ſuch a ſpirit, or ſpirits were expelled or caſt out

out of the bodies of men, cannot be admitted, but must be attributed to the miſtaken opinion they had concerning ſuch a being, and his power over men; and therefore, that in thoſe relations there is not any real evidence or proof for the truth of the Chriſtian religion; however they were then and have ſince been urged to that purpoſe even in this age.

In aſſerting and maintaining what I have juſt mentioned, as what appears to me is built upon unqueſtionable evidence, I know I differ very much from men of high repute for their great learning and abilities, who have been, and ſtill are advocates for the contrary opinion.

Whatever credit is juſtly due to the writings of the Fathers as it reſpects their account of real tranſactions which then took place, and of which they were competent to judge, and in recording which, their minds were not influenced by any ſtrong religious prejudices of education, may be admitted; yet, in the caſes we have mentioned, there is, in my opinion, juſt ground to diſbelieve them, as what neither Scripture nor any real facts evince the truth of. To urge, that ſome of the Fathers, and other writers ſince, were men of great abilities and learning, as well as of integrity, which I do not deny, and therefore that they were competent to judge in ſuch caſes as we are mentioning, is not, in my opinion, a ſufficient ſecurity againſt their being miſtaken concerning them, as not viſible to their notice and inſpection, and in which they were liable to be miſguided in their judgment by the ſtrength of rooted prejudices, not only from education, but by the concurring ſentiments of many others their cotemporaries.

FINIS.

the Devil, or Satan, and his tempting men to ſin, it eventually and decidedly proves that the Heathen oracles and the Prieſts and Prieſteſſes being inſpired by ſuch a being, is entirely groundleſs, there being not the leaſt proof of their reality; but they wholly originated from, and were ſupported by the cunning and artful. Whether the learned or unlearned, or both, who were concerned therein, and who, therefore, whether from ſiniſter or political ends, or both, impoſed on the weakneſs and credulity of the people.

And theſe obſervations, and the concluſion juſt mentioned, are equally true, as it reſpects demons, i. e. the ſouls of men departed, whether of heroes or others.

POSTSCRIPT.

If the foregoing proofs, from Scripture, and the reaſoning deduced from them, that there is not any real evidence of there being any fallen angel, or angels; and that they tempt men to ſin, is juſtly founded, it will eventually and decidedly prove, that no man in any paſt age of the world, hath been poſſeſſed by one of them; and, conſequently, that any bodily or mental diſorders, or both, that have, by Dr. Worthington and others, been aſcribed to their power in, or over men, is wholly void of any evident or real proof from Scripture; and conſequently, that the teſtimony of the Fathers in the primitive ages, or by any other writers in more modern ones, have not any real foundation in truth, notwithſtanding the very circumſtantial relations they gave of them, and conſequently, that the many accounts which thoſe writers give of the manner or the means by which they have aſſerted that ſuch a ſpirit, or ſpirits were expelled or caſt

out

out of the bodies of men, cannot be admitted, but must be attributed to the miſtaken opinion they had concerning ſuch a being, and his power over men; and therefore, that in thoſe relations there is not any real evidence or proof for the truth of the Chriſtian religion; however they were then and have ſince been urged to that purpoſe even in this age.

In aſſerting and maintaining what I have juſt mentioned, as what appears to me is built upon unqueſtionable evidence, I know I differ very much from men of high repute for their great learning and abilities, who have been, and ſtill are advocates for the contrary opinion.

Whatever credit is juſtly due to the writings of the Fathers as it reſpects their account of real tranſactions which then took place, and of which they were competent to judge, and in recording which, their minds were not influenced by any ſtrong religious prejudices of education, may be admitted; yet, in the caſes we have mentioned, there is, in my opinion, juſt ground to diſbelieve them, as what neither Scripture nor any real facts evince the truth of. To urge, that ſome of the Fathers, and other writers ſince, were men of great abilities and learning, as well as of integrity, which I do not deny, and therefore that they were competent to judge in ſuch caſes as we are mentioning, is not, in my opinion, a ſufficient ſecurity againſt their being miſtaken concerning them, as not viſible to their notice and inſpection, and in which they were liable to be miſguided in their judgment by the ſtrength of rooted prejudices, not only from education, but by the concurring ſentiments of many others their cotemporaries.

FINIS.

BY THE AUTHOR,

NEW and DECISIVE PROOFS,

FROM

SCRIPTURE and REASON,

THAT

ADULTS ONLY ARE INCLUDED

IN THE

DESIGN of the NEW COVENANT,

OR THE

GOSPEL DISPENSATION,

AND WERE

MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST,
IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

OFFERED AS A REPLY

TO

Mr. WILLIAMS's ATTEMPT,

IN A LATE TREATISE,

TO PROVE THAT

BY BAPTISM INFANTS WERE INITIATED

INTO THE

CHURCH of CHRIST,

AND

MEMBERS OF IT AT THAT TIME.

SOLD BY JOHNSON, IN ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, LONDON; AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

The opinion of the Monthly Reviewers
Some publications by this author
have formerly attracted our notice
New Series Vol 2 475 In this present
555 attempt we think he improves
in Stile & manner It is but justice to
observe that he does not content him-
self with second-hand knowledge
but appears to be ~~qualified~~ acquainted
with the original languages of the
Scriptures He lays great stress on
the argument that no revelation is
made of fallen Spirits in the old
Testament & he further observes
there is not the ~~least~~ least account in the
new that Jesus declared such a Doc-
trine to the apostles or Evangelists
He has been very industerous in
collecting the passages of sacred writ
which have any relation to his
immediate subject & he attends to
them with pertinent remarks
There is one paragraph relative
to Michael the arch-angel & to the
Devil to which we think he has not
adverted most if not all the others
are brought under examination
If Mr Ashdowne should be
thought to fail in any requisite
of a good writer he is certainly
entitled to the encomium of a

modest & candid disputant who instead of contending for victory enquires after truth. The conclusion which he endeavours to support is by no means new but every capable & attentive reader will perceive that there is reason & strength in his representations.

There are some few topics of dispute of which there is room to think that much has been discovered & her cause will maintained tho' bigotry policy interest be prevent a general acknowledgement & men proceed in the old path however mistaken. In the present case it must be allowed that the writers arguments are by no means deficient in weight it must also be added that it is a matter or subject yet undetermined

The author's own writing, as also the insertions between pp. 38–39.

J. H. Black

modest & Candid disputant who
instead of contending for victory
enquires after truth. The con-
clusion which he endeavours to
support is by no means new but
every capable & attentive reader will
perceive that there is reason &
strength in his representations.
There are some few topics of
dispute of which there is room
to think that much has been
discovered & new cause will main-
tained tho' bigotty policy
interest be prevent a general
acknowledgement & men pro-
ceed in the old path however
mistaken. In the present case
it must be allowed that the
writers arguments are by no
means deficient in weight it
must also be added that it is
a matter or subject yet
undetermined

The Author's own writing, as also the insertions between pp. 38–39. J. H. Black